1	U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
2	CIVIL RIGHTS AND VOTING IN ILLINOIS
3	Thursday, March 9, 2017
4	
5	STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
6	had in the above-mentioned matter held at the Ralph
7	H. Metcalfe Federal Building, 3rd Floor, 77 West
8	Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, commencing at
9	8:08 o'clock a.m.
10	ILLINOIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
11	MR. JUAN CARLOS LINARES, Chair
12	MS. JOANNA BOHDZIEWICZ-BOROWIEC
13	MS. CINDY BUYS
14	MR. KENDRIC COBB
15	MR. TREVOR COPELAND
16	MR. RICHARD GARCIA
17	MS. TABASSUM HALEEM
18	MR. WILLIAM HOWARD
19	MR. REYHAD KAZMI
20	MR. MALIK NEVELS
21	MS. EVELYN RODRIGUEZ
22	MS. ANNE WORTHAM
23	Reported By: Anna M. Morales, CSR, RMR
24	License No.: 084-002854



(Whereupon, the following 1 proceedings commenced at 2 8:08 o'clock a.m.) 3 4 CHAIRMAN LINARES: This meeting of the Illinois Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil 5 6 Rights shall come to order. 7 My name is Juan Carlos Linares. I am the Chair of this committee. Members of the committee 8 are also present today, and I would like for them 9 to introduce themselves starting with Ms. Anne 10 11 Wortham. 12 MS. WORTHAM: Again, good morning. 13 Anne Wortham, and I am an Associate Professor of Sociology at Illinois State University, Department 14 of Anthropology and Sociology. 15 MR. COPELAND: My name is Trevor Copeland. 16 17 an attorney in private practice at Brinks Gilson & 18 I do primarily patent prosecution and have 19 been involved as a committee member for about four. 20 five vears now. MR. COBB: Good morning. Kendrick Cobb. 21 T'm here in Chicago. I'm an attorney also, inhouse 22 23 counsel, compliance labor and employment. MS. BUYS: Good morning. 24 My name is



1	Cindy Buys, and I'm a professor of law down at
2	Southern Illinois University at the other end of
3	the state.
4	MS. BOHDZIEWICZ-BOROWIEC: Good morning. I'm
5	Joanna Bohdziewicz-Borowiec. My areas are
6	community development and immigrant rights in
7	particular.
8	MS. RODRIGUEZ: Good morning, I am
9	Evelyn Rodriguez. I serve as an advisor in the
10	Office of the Mayor, City of Chicago.
11	MS. HALEEM: Good morning. I'm
12	Tabassum Haleem. I'm a CPA by profession. Most
13	recently, I was the Executive Director of the
14	Council of Islamic Associations of Greater Chicago.
15	Welcome.
16	CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, everyone. And
17	we'll have some other committee members join us
18	later in the day, and as they come, they'll
19	introduce themselves as well when they arrive.
20	Again, I'm Juan Carlos Linares, and I'm
21	also the Executive Director of the Latin United
22	Community Housing Commission otherwise known as
23	LUCHA.

We have some other friends here who are



staff of both the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights and the Illinois division. I'll name them for now, and if you can either raise your hand or present yourselves to show you are present.

Mr. Mauro Morales, U.S. Commission on

Civil Rights staff director. Mr. David Mussatt.

Is he here? He's the Supervisory Chief of the Region Programs Unit. Melissa Wojnaroski, Civil Rights Analyst here in Chicago. David Paredes.

He's not here. He's a Civil Rights Analyst.

Anna Fortes. She's in the back. She's also a Civil Rights Analyst. Carolyn Allen is in the back doing work. She's the administrative assistant for the Chicago office. Victoria Moreno. There she is, front row. She's a civil rights intern here in Chicago office. Olivia Wilk. She's a civil rights intern as well. And then one more intern, Brianna Davidson.

So we are honored to have our staff director, Mauro Morales, who is with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, as I mentioned.

Mr. Morales, he will be addressing you in a moment.

For now, Mr. Kazmi has joined us. If you could briefly introduce yourself and where you're



working or where you're from.

MR. KAZMI: Okay. Hi. My name is
Reyhad Kazmi. I obviously serve here on the
Advisory Committee. I'm here from Chicago. Work
for an organization called National Youth Advocate
Program and also a consultant.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, Mr. Kazmi.

So the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent bipartisan agency of the federal government charged with studying discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin or in the administration of justice.

In each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, an Advisory Committee to the Commission has been established, and they are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation to advise the Commission on relevant information concerning their respective states.

Today, our purpose is to hear testimony regarding the state of voting rights in Illinois and related civil concerns. With an unprecedented election behind us, the issues of voting rights and



access to the ballot have never been more prominent. This Committee has determined that as an issue of paramount importance in exercising one's constitutional rights, we must more closely explore the state of voting rights and ballot access in Illinois.

Today's testimony is intended to explore this critical issue in greater detail and to make recommendations to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to address outstanding civil rights concerns as they pertain to voting. As speakers begin to veer away from civil rights questions at hand and to discuss possibly important but unrelated topics, I will interrupt and ask them to refrain from doing so.

At the conclusion of today's meeting, the Committee intends to prepare a report to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights detailing findings and recommendations for addressing this issue of national importance.

The report will be available for public review, and we are grateful to all the panelists and members of the public for their willingness to share their related experiences with us today.



At the outset, I want to remind everyone present of the ground rules. This is a public meeting open to the media and to the general public. We have a very full schedule of people who will be making presentations within the limited time available. The allotted time for each presentation must be strictly adhered to. This will include a presentation by each participant of approximately 10 to 12 minutes.

After all the panelists have concluded their statements, the Committee members will engage them in question and answer. To accommodate persons who are not on the agenda but wish to make statements, we have scheduled an open forum today at 4:15 p.m. Anyone wishing to make a statement during that period should contact

Melissa Wojnaroski or other Commission staff to have your name placed on a list of speakers.

In addition, written statements may be submitted to the Committee members or staff present here today or they may be sent to -- they may be sent by mail to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at 55 West Monroe Street, Suite 410, Chicago, Illinois, 60603, or by e-mail to



Melissa Wojnaroski, and her card and information are available at the sign-in desk -- behind the sign-in desk.

Though some of the statements made today may be controversial, we want to ensure that all invited guests do not defame or degrade any person or any organization. As Chair, I reserve the privilege to cut short any statements that defame, degrade or do not pertain to the issue at hand. Committee members may also speak up if they feel that this is occurring.

In order to ensure that all aspects of the issues are represented, knowledgeable persons with a wide variety of experience and view points have been invited to share information with us. Any person or any organization that feels defamed or degraded by statements made in these proceedings should contact our staff during the meeting so that we can provide a chance for public response.

Alternately, such persons or organizations can file written statements for inclusion in the proceedings.

The Advisory Committee appreciates the willingness of all participants to share their



views and experiences with this committee.

answer portion of the panel discussion are as follows: The Committee may ask questions of the entire panel or to individual members of the panel after all panelists have had the opportunity to provide their prepared statement. There will be one exception to that later. The Advisory Committee members must be recognized by the Chair before asking any questions of the participants.

In addition, because of the large number of members and short amount of time, each Committee member will be limited to one question plus a follow-up. Exceptions will occur from time to time. When five minutes are left in the session, the Chair will announce that the last question may be asked.

At this time, I would like to turn the podium over to Mr. Mauro Morales, staff director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

MR. MORALES: Thank you, Juan Carlos, and thank you, panelists, for coming and attending this morning and for all the rest of them that will come. And more importantly, I thank all of you for



your time.

I bring greetings from the Chair of the U.S. Commission, Catherine E. Lhamon. She was appointed in December and voted by the majority of Commissioners to become the Chair. And so she unfortunately had wanted to come out here and participate today but family matters kept her at home.

But in any case, I just want to reiterate, thank you for all the work you're doing and let you know how important this is. Certainly this topic is important obviously with what's going on in the country. I'll tell you that the State Advisory Committee in California did a hearing on voting rights in California. Their report is forthcoming. The State of Kansas Advisory Committee did a report on voting rights in their state. That report is being finalized a week from tomorrow. The Commission is going to be having our monthly business meeting, and the Chair of the Kansas State Advisory Committee will be presenting the report to the Commissioners.

So the work you're doing is very important, and I want you to know that, that when



you finish the report where I can almost guarantee that you will have an opportunity to present it to the Commissioners, and it may become a topic that the Commissioners look at next year. We don't know yet.

But, in any case, I just want you to know there's a lot of things you'd be doing. You all have jobs. You all have families and careers and things that you would be doing other than coming here and participating. I can't thank you enough and let you know how important the work is that you do and what you're doing today.

So, again, greetings from the

Commissioner. I'm Mauro Morales. I'm staff

director. I'll be here all morning. I have to

unfortunately go back to Washington this afternoon,

but please come by and say hello or introduce

yourselves. And, again, I would like to hear from

you, please.

Advisory committee members, I have worked with some of you. I came out here I believe about a year and a half ago and saw the good work you did during that hearing on environmental issues. In fact, your report, one of the topics are in the



report that we finally did. So the work you do is very much appreciated and utilized by the Commission itself.

So, again, with that, thank you, and I will let you kick off your briefing.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much,
Mr. Morales. We also appreciate the support that
you have given us during this time especially you
just mentioned last year's committee on the
environmental justice issues, and everything seemed
to just go so smoothly with your support and your
staff support.

I also want to give a special thanks to the Chicago staff for this particular set of panel hearings who were instrumental and help lead the way with us in terms of getting this in today. So thank you very much everyone.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to the first panel, and I will introduce each one of you. So the first panel is going to be discussing legal and academic research on voting rights. I will introduce each one of you, and then we'll start from your right, my left, and you'll each have 10 to 12 minutes to present. I will also have



time cards here to let you know when your time is coming, and then we'll go on to the next speaker from there.

So first we have Ruth Greenwood from the Campaign Legal Center. We also have Ami Gandhi from the Chicago Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. We have Mr. Jacob Huebert from the Liberty Justice Center. And we have Rebecca Glenberg from the American Civil Liberties Union of Illinois.

So without further ado, Ms. Ruth Greenwood, if you want to start.

MS. GREENWOOD: Thank you very much and thank you to the members of the state Committee for holding these hearings on voting rights at this important time.

My name is Ruth Greenwood. I'm the Deputy Director of Redistricting at the Campaign Legal Center. The Campaign Legal Center is a national nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that defends and protects our democracy in the areas of campaign finance, voting rights, redistricting, and government ethics. My work focuses on redistricting reform, and I have been working on



redistricting in the Midwest for the past four years. I want to note that I do all my work here in Illinois with my very talented colleague,
Annabelle Harless, who is here with me today.

Now others here will talk about access to the ballot, but I want to focus today on access to a meaningful ballot. I'm going to outline two areas of reform at the local level and state level that I believe are needed. I have submitted written materials to explain each of these areas in greater detail. So if you want footnotes, feel free to read on.

In 2015, Annabelle and I authored a report that I understand has been made part of the record called the Color of Representation that showed that there are numerous cities, towns, villages, and school boards that have growing minority populations but all or majority white councils or boards to govern them.

I want to start with a brief background on why minority representation is important. There are many reasons, but some of them include the fact that representatives of color can be role models for children of color. Local representatives can



go on to be better qualified state or federal representatives. They can change the attitude of the community towards minority legislators and minority community partners. It has been shown that improving minority representation improves civic participation by people of color. It also has been shown to increase confidence in government by all members of the community. And, finally, it's just morally right that people of color should have the same opportunity to serve as local representatives as white people.

So armed with the knowledge from the report that we wrote, Annabelle and I have worked over the past few years with a number of local communities to try to improve minority representation. The overwhelming lesson from these efforts is that creating change at the local level is tough but possible. Some of the constraints include that there are limited resources to support local organizing efforts; that central authorities are powerful and able to control or even manipulate the ballot initiative process; and litigation can be costly and time-consuming.

We noted in the 2015 report that the



federal Voting Rights Act would be the right tool to use as a remedy in this situation. Despite this, in fact, many of the suburbs and exurbs particularly around Chicago are increasingly residentially integrated. This is fantastic from the point of view of reducing segregation as having been a goal of the Civil Rights Act, but it's problematic when it comes to running a case under the Voting Rights Act to improve minority representation because you need to show that there is a segregated enough community to draw a district around that community.

A possible solution for integrated communities that are still not electing members of the minority community to positions on local boards is to use ranked choice voting with multi-member districts. Ranked choice voting has been endorsed by Attorney General Madigan as an approved method that can be used in local elections, but in order for home-rule jurisdictions to implement it, they need to approve a ballot measure.

Just briefly, ranked choice voting is where you write your preferences one, two, three. If your number one vote doesn't get elected, your



vote will move over to number two. So the best high profile example of where it would be useful is back in 2000 with Bush v. Gore. There were a lot of people that voted for third parties. If those third-party votes could have given a number two vote, we would have known whether Bush was more preferred or Gore was more preferred by the majority of the state. And this could happen at the local level again and again.

In particular, for the minority community, it means that you can have different minority groups. So say, for example, a black community and a Latino community that have different number one preferences, but as long as they preference each other for number two, you'll end up getting somebody elected that is the choice of the overall minority community.

In that report, we identified over 30 jurisdictions where there are minority communities that are underrepresented on their local boards.

I want talk about one example. I have worked for many years with the Concerned Citizens of Joliet as they have tried to place a



redistricting initiative on their local ballot.

Three times their efforts have been thwarted by the local powers that be. I believe that the process for approval of ballot initiatives at the local level is flawed in favor of those currently in power to the detriment of regular voters.

The Illinois state law requires that a local election board is convened if a ballot is objected to. For a city, that board is to consist of the mayor, the most senior council member, and the city clerk. In reality, when it comes to electoral reforms like redistricting, this means that the people whose power voters are trying to change are in charge of deciding whether their citizens can vote to change how they get and use power.

I have a number of recommendations and I'll go through a few. I think that federally we need guidance from the Department of Justice and possibly the courts to allow for cases to be brought -- Voting Rights Act cases to be brought in communities with racially polarized voting but that do not have a sufficient concentration of minority community members to draw a single member district



that's majority-minority. At the state level, I think we need to change the way that ballot measures disputes are decided so that the decision-makers are not the people who are affected by the ballot measure itself.

I want to move on to my state level recommendations because I've also done a bunch of work with independent redistricting commissions over the past few years.

Partisan interests have entirely hijacked the redistricting process in Illinois such that in every decade since 1980 one party or the other has been able to enact its preferred state legislative plan and, as a result, the state has suffered constant partisan gerrymanders instead of fair district plans. It gives power to current incumbents over the voters in Illinois.

These gerrymanders result in unresponsive and unaccountable legislators. A preferred method of redistricting would be to use an independent commission to improve partisan fairness, competitiveness, and responsiveness. Three efforts to introduce an independent commission have been thwarted by state courts in recent years.



As a consequence of this broken redistricting system, the people of Illinois have been denied competitive elections and have been saddled with too many legislators who care more about their own self-interest than the will of the people.

The only time the Republicans and Democrats worked together to produce a consensus-driven redistricting plan was in 1971. In 1981, '91, and 2010, the General Assembly gridlocked, causing a back-up commission to be convened, with the name of the tie-breaking voter, a Republican or Democrat, literally drawn from a hat by random chance. The result of this lottery was that in 1981 and 2001, the Democrats drew their state lines for their own advantage without Republican input. And, similarly, 1991 Republicans drew the lines without the opposition input also for their own advantage.

In 2011, the Democrats had control of the General Assembly and the governorship and completely excluded the public and Republicans from the map-making process. The resulting redistricting plans disproportionately favored the



election of Democrats, stifled political competition, and ensured that politicians were choosing their voters, not the other way around.

Today, sophisticated Geographic Information Systems software packages and computerized regression models can incorporate past election results -- and I should say this is not only at the state level, this can happen at the local level as well -- can incorporate past election results, demographics, public records, and multiple commercial databases to make predictions with pinpoint accuracy of where supporters and opponents of particular parties and candidates live and how these patterns will change as the decade unfolds. These data can be used to evaluate the consequences of multiple district configurations allowing map-drawers to craft and choose a redistricting plan that optimizes partisan gain.

The results of this technological sophistication can be seen in a degree to which parties are able to benefit themselves, not just here in Illinois, but across the country. We have seen the extent of partisan advantage in the current cycle post 2010 has skyrocketed to a



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

greater extent than any time in the past 40 years.

In addition to pursuing partisan advantage, map-drawers in Illinois have virtually guaranteed reelection of incumbents of both political parties allowing many legislators to act without regard for the views of their constituents. If a district is safely drawn for an incumbent, and therefore the election outcome predetermined, there is little incentive for the challenger to raise the necessary funds and to put in the time and effort needed to run for election.

Proof that reelection of incumbents is virtually guaranteed is shown in how many uncontested elections there are in Illinois. In 2016, 64 percent of State House races were uncontested and 75 percent of State Senate races were uncontested.

My recommendation for this problem is for Illinois to change, to use an independent commission like that proposed by the Independent Map Amendment team in 2015 and 2016.
Unfortunately, the State Supreme Court split along partisan lines with the four judges that had been appointed by Democrats voting to keep the amendment



1 off the ballot and three judges appointed by 2 Republicans voted to put the amendment on the ballot. 3 4 If we can remove or at least reduce the 5 role of partisanship in statewide redistricting, it 6 will be better for all the voters in Illinois. 7 Thank you. I look forward to your 8 questions. 9 Thank you so much. CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Greenwood. Before we proceed, I would like to 10 11 ask in the audience because the microphone seems to 12 be a little lacking, can you hear in the back? 13 Is there a control for that? okav. 14 They're at max right now. MS. WOJNAROSKI: we're asking all the panelists to make sure to 15 really put the mic up to your mouth. 16 17 CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Gandhi. 18 MS. GANDHI: Thanks for the opportunity to 19 speak today. I'll share a little bit of background 20 and then start with the PowerPoint presentation 21 that I think is being loaded right now.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm Ami Gandhi, and I'm the Director of Voting Rights and Civic Empowerment at Chicago



22

23

Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.
Chicago Lawyers Committee is a nonprofit,
nonpartisan civil rights legal organization in
operation since the Civil Rights era in 1969, and
we work to secure racial equity and economic
opportunity for all. We provide legal
representation through partnerships with nearly
50 member law firms. We also collaborate with
grassroots organizations and diverse coalitions to
implement community-based solutions that advance
civil rights.

The voting rights project of our organization was established to prevent, reduce, and eliminate barriers to voting for communities of color and low-income residents in Illinois. We advocate for expanded voter access for all communities regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic or disability status.

And a major component of our work is

Election Protection, the nation's largest

nonpartisan voter protection program. Election

Protection's hot line and poll watcher volunteers

have answered thousands of voter questions over the

phone and in person. That puts us in a unique



position to understand voter access barriers. For the 2016 general election, we trained and deployed hundreds of law firms and other volunteer attorneys with diverse political views, but they stand united in the belief that all eligible voters should have access to the polls.

Illinois has made great strides to expand its citizens' voting rights in recent years, but much work remains, particularly for those voters who are most vulnerable to discrimination and exclusion. To address these barriers in a comprehensive and practical way, community organizations, government leaders, and election administrators must all work together.

And now I would like to share some data with you from the last election and the stories that we heard from voters. And so that will be displayed on the PowerPoint slide. You can see it on either of the screens, but it may be easier to see it on the large screen.

The first slide is an overview of our Election Protection Program. We have hot lines in various languages, and through that process, we've heard firsthand about voters' concerns and barriers



that they face at the polls.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We partner with many grassroots organizations who are listed on this slide, and we'll submit all of this written information into the record as well. But we wanted to start by giving you a flavor of the diversity of organizations, neighborhoods, and communities that we collaborate with, and our legal volunteers who answer voter's questions in person and over the phone are trained to do various things to understand voter access barriers and investigate and remedy problematic practices, provide information and education and information on voting rights and advocate for necessary reforms. We will talk about various types of real-life examples of barriers that voters face.

Next, we'll share a visual about how our process works. When a voter experiences a barrier or an issue or has a question, there are multiple ways that the voter can connect with getting help from us. Again, we're nonpartisan and we try everything we can to provide the information to the voters who have questions. And after we interface with the voter, collect their information, and



analyze the issue, we collaborate with poll workers. In Illinois, they're called election judges, people who -- the personnel who work at the polls, and we also work with election administrators and election officials. We see it as a success if we can resolve the issue on the spot and if a voter can gain access to the polls and if we're -- and we also log whether we're able to resolve that issue in partnership with the voter or not.

The program is national, but today's data will focus on issues in Illinois. So this slide is an overview of the types of issues that we heard during this past general election. As you can see, there were numerous issues. Many of them were resolved as I'll talk about, but many of them were also preventable which is troubling to us.

Many Illinois counties are represented through the information that we receive and a diversity of voters who are reaching us with issues. Now there are a significant number of voters of color who report problems at the polls, but as I'll discuss in detail, there are people from all backgrounds, including white voters who



also faced preventable problems at the polls.

Most of the inquiries and problems that we learned about happened on election day and also a huge number right before the election. This is relevant because it shows the need for tools like election day registration and other access measures that can help people even who have questions right at the last minute leading up to the election or on election day itself.

This slide presents a breakdown of the different types of election day issues that were reported to us. Most of the issues related to questions that voters had about polling place location and election day registration, a relatively new access tool that's part of the Many voters also had inquiries about Illinois law. People also faced voter equipment registration. issues, polling place operation issues, reports -we got reports of a voter having an incorrect voter status in the system and being turned away from the polls as a result in many instances. We received reports of fragmented and partially filled ballots as well as the broader other categories including electioneering, impermissible electioneering and



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

missing absentee or mail-in ballots and other situations where the mail-in ballot process broke down.

This visual goes over the voting experience for the voters who interface with us. So whether it's inquiries about registration, inexperience inside the polling place, operation issue, we hear from people who need assistance, support, and clarity throughout all parts of the voting process.

I wanted to share with you a few stories of the types of issues that we hear about. Here is one where a voter had an inquiry about registration and they faced a barrier at the poll and, because of election day registration, was able to register and vote. We heard about these types of issues from throughout the state, not just in the Chicago area.

And in the interest of time, I'll go through these a bit faster but I'm happy to submit anything else to the written record or answer any questions.

We also received reports of electioneering including situations where voters were intimidated



or pressured to vote for a particular candidate including in the area where that electioneering was impermissible. Incorrect voter status also came up for many community members at various backgrounds again throughout the state. And there were also numerous polling place operation issues including -- this is just one sample of the many types of stories we heard of voters who did not get to vote because the polls weren't open on time.

There were many instances of fragmented and partially filled ballots, instances where voters received one of multiple pages of a ballot and weren't given access to the full ballot they were entitled to. Also instances where a ballot was partially completed and, of course, that incorrectly occurred. Voter equipment issues were endemic in this past election throughout the state.

Other barriers include voter intimidation and barriers for voters interfacing with the criminal justice system including barriers facing individuals in pretrial detention who should be eligible to vote but in a practical sense aren't always afforded the access to that right.

We also heard about barriers for voters



leaving incarceration who should be able to get back on the rolls but because of ID requirements for registration or other barriers were not again functionally able to vote. You'll hear stories throughout the day about barriers for voters with disabilities, for homeless voters, and language access barriers as well.

You heard about our process for logging and analyzing complaints, and what we do equipped with that information informs our litigation, our administrative and legislative reform, and our community outreach.

I want to share a little bit about election day registration before I conclude. We received hundreds of calls from voters asking about their voter registration status, in general, and about election day registration requirements specifically. Voters in every county used this tool. Numerous voters used it in the general election and in the primaries, and we saw the alternative in past elections and in neighboring states when voters didn't have the tool and were instead turned away from the polls in states like Indiana, for example, that we also received calls



from.

As we have argued in our amicus brief
submitted in the federal court litigation that's
currently challenging election day registration, if
there are to be any adjustments made to this
program, which is absolutely essential for voter
access in Illinois, we advocate for an expansion of
availability of election day registration and not
to go backwards in time by curtailing this access
tool. And I should note, too, that we collaborate
closely with election administrators who are in
Democratic leaning counties, who are in Republican
leaning committees representing a political
diversity of voters, and many election
administrators who are proud of having tools like
election day registration are on board with the
idea of common sense technological improvements
like automatic voter registration regardless of
their political lean and want to see the integrity
and the accuracy of our voting system move in a
forward direction.

There are common sense and bipartisan support reforms on the table right now in Illinois including automatic voter registration, and we



1 advocate for those. And especially in this 2 environment where there is rhetoric and unfounded 3 allegations of widespread voter fraud and a 4 discomfort and even exclusion from the polls faced by vulnerable communities, it's essential for us to 5 6 look at some of the really positive and problem-solving oriented models in Illinois where 7 8 advocates, voters, and election officials from 9 diverse political backgrounds work together to try 10 to improve the voting process which ends up 11 benefiting communities of color but also has positive repercussions for all of our voters 12 13 including members of the military, veterans, elderly voters, and a broader diversity. 14 15 CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, Ms. Gandhi. And 16 we'll have a session for question and answer 17 afterwards, too, so we can continue the 18 conversation. Mr. Jacob Huebert. You can proceed. 19 20 MR. HUEBERT: Thank you, and thanks to the 21 committee for inviting me to speak here today. 22

In 2014, the Illinois General Assembly passed a law creating a permanent system for election day voter registration in Illinois. That



23

might sound like a positive development, but the scheme that the state enacted is fundamentally flawed because it guarantees citizens in some part of the state much better opportunities to register and vote than it gives to citizens in other parts of the state. And that's why at the Liberty Justice Center we filed a lawsuit challenging Illinois' election day registration scheme for violating the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

Before getting into the problems with the current scheme, I should give some background in the history of voter registration in Illinois.

Before the 2014 general election, Illinois didn't allow anyone to register to vote on election day.

It had a normal voter registration period followed by a grace period that went through the third day before an election. During the grace period, a citizen could register to vote in a county clerk's office or a specially designated voter registration site.

In 2014, the Illinois General Assembly passed and Governor Pat Quinn signed a pilot program for election day voter registration in



Illinois. Under the pilot program, the state extended the grace period for late registration up to and including election day. The pilot program allowed the citizens to register and vote on election day at the office of their county or city election authority or at a permanent polling place for early voting established by their election authority.

About a month after the November 2014 election, the General Assembly rapidly considered and passed the permanent system for election voter day registration that we now have which is different from the pilot program. Under the permanent system, a citizen can register and vote at any of several locations during the grace period, the office of the election authority, a permanent polling place for early voting, any early voting site beginning 15 days before the election or any precinct polling place on election day.

But that last option, registering at your polling place on election day, isn't actually guaranteed to all Illinois citizens who are eligible to vote. The statute only mandates that election authorities in Illinois counties with a



population of a hundred thousand or more offer election day registration at all polling places. Counties with a population of less than a hundred thousand that don't use electronic polling books are not required to provide election day registration at all polling places. They can just provide it at the election authority's main office and at one polling place in any municipality where 20 percent or more of the county's residents live.

So now Illinois now guarantees a right to election day registration in every polling place to citizens who live in the 20 Illinois counties with a population of a hundred thousand or more but not to the citizens in the state's 82 other counties.

In the November 2016 election, all but four of those low population counties that don't have to offer election day registration at polling places didn't offer it at polling places. So now voters in high population counties have much better opportunities to register and vote than citizens in most low population counties in Illinois. And that's a problem.

The Supreme Court has said that the right to vote is a right to vote on an equal basis with



other citizens in your jurisdiction. The government isn't allowed to value the votes of one group of citizens over the votes of another group of citizens.

We recognize this problem and we agreed to represent two plaintiffs who wanted to challenge the law, a challenging Republican party committee with a low population in a downstate county and a congressional candidate from a downstate county running in a district that included both a low population county and high population counties.

And, of course, he perceived that that put him at a disadvantage because his voters he perceived to be concentrated in lower population counties had less of an opportunity to register and vote than the voters in the high population counties who might tend to favor his opponent.

So in August of last year, we filed our lawsuit challenging this scheme in the Federal District Court here in Chicago, and we filed a motion seeking a preliminary injunction to prevent the state from implementing this scheme in the November 2016 election. The District Court granted a preliminary injection on September 27th, but the



7th Circuit Court of Appeals then stayed the order without explanation. So the system was in effect for the recent election.

The case is still pending in court, and so now I'll talk about the merits of the constitutional case from the plaintiff's perspective.

when a citizen challenges a law that restricts voting rights or favors some voters over others, the law can only be upheld if the Court concludes that the burden the restriction imposes on voting rights is outweighed by the government interest the restriction supposedly serves. In our lawsuit, the state has argued that the election day registration scheme is justified because it serves the state's interest in ensuring the citizens can exercise the right to vote by expanding opportunities for election day registration. Before, nobody in Illinois could register and vote on election day, and now a lot of people can. So the argument goes, well, that's an improvement and we're allowed to make improvements in access to voting.

Of course, there can be no doubt that the



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

state has a strong interest in expanding opportunities to vote and that election day registration at polling places is an appropriate way to do that.

The problem is the state has to show more than that. It has to show that its discrimination against those citizens in low population counties is justified by some government interest, and it hasn't done that. The state has argued that its discrimination is justified because polling place registration supposedly is more needed in high population counties.

Under the pilot program, there were media reports and long lines at centralized election day registration locations in Cook County, but there weren't similar media reports of long lines for centralized election day voter registration locations in low population counties.

And so the argument goes, registration at polling places was more urgently needed in high population counties and so that's why the state supposedly is justified in mandating it in those high population counties but not in the low population counties.



There's several problems with that argument. For one, it hasn't been substantiated in court that nobody had to wait in lines at those low population counties, and even if that's true that they didn't have long lines for election day registration in low population counties, it wasn't proved that polling place registration is less needed in those low population counties.

It could be that traveling to the centralized location for many people in a low population county is so burdensome that they just didn't bother to try it. If you have to drive 20 miles to register and vote on election day, it's pretty intuitive that you might just skip it rather than do it. So that could explain why we didn't see lines like that in low population counties. The government didn't present any evidence on that one way or the other.

Another problem with the state's argument is that long lines that were reported in Cook County don't explain why the state-mandated election day voter registration in polling places in all 20 Illinois high population counties since, as far as we know, there weren't reports of long



lines in those other 19 counties. So one has to wonder what could explain why they chose the top 20 counties in Illinois. And it's certainly interesting to note that, collectively, the top 20 counties in Illinois consistently over the past decade or more have always voted for the Democratic candidate in statewide elections, and this scheme of election day registration just happens to have passed along party lines. And so perhaps that's an explanation.

I don't want to speculate as to any particular person's motive, but when you look at this, if you were trying to boost one party's turnout over another, this is the sort of thing that you might set up.

In any event, if the statewide voters in high population counties were more likely to benefit from polling place registration, that shouldn't be a good enough reason to deny the opportunity in low population counties. The state shouldn't be granting and denying people rights based on who it thinks is going to take the most advantage of them.

The state's other main argument and



defense of this scheme is that election authorities in many low population counties would find it too costly or too burdensome to implement election day registration in polling places. Well, in general, courts have not found avoidance of administrative inconvenience or cost to be a good enough reason to violate constitutional rights, in particular, voting rights and, in particular, in cases where some voters would have better rights than others.

Second problem, the state hasn't actually shown that it would be more expensive or harder to do in the lower population counties; and, third, and most important, it's wrong to give citizens in high population counties better voting rights because their counties have more resources. I mean, the state is essentially admitting with this argument that it's giving people in wealthier counties better opportunities because their counties are wealthier; and, of course, your voting right shouldn't depend on whether you live in a relatively affluent county.

So in this lawsuit, we've asked the Court to strike down this scheme of election day registration, not because we don't want election



day registration or election day registration at polling places, but because that's the only way a court can address this constitutional problem, by simply striking it down. It can't rewrite the law that mandates that low population counties do this because the General Assembly hasn't addressed how that should be funded or anything like that. So the right thing for a court to do is to strike it down and to tell the General Assembly to enact a new scheme if it wants election day registration that's fair and equal.

But, of course, it shouldn't have to come to that. The Illinois General Assembly could just amend this law now to provide for election day registration at polling places everywhere in Illinois which, oh, by the way, is what every other state that has election day registration at polling places has done. Every other state guarantees it statewide. Only Illinois has favored voters in some counties over others.

So the General Assembly should correct this problem, and then our lawsuit can go away, and there will be increased access to voting across Illinois. Thank you.



CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much,

Mr. Huebert.

Ms. Rebecca Glenberg. Proceed, please.

MS. GLENBERG: Thank you. Good morning and thanks to the Commission and to the Advisory Committee for holding this hearing and for inviting the ACLU to participate.

My name is Rebecca Glenberg. I'm a senior staff attorney at the ACLU of Illinois, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that advocates for constitutional rights and civil rights at the state and federal level and that has been involved in protecting voting rights nationwide through its voting rights project and in the state's -- through each of its state affiliates.

I'm here to talk today a little bit about voter ID laws. Here in Illinois, we do not require photo identification at the polls in most instances, but as I will discuss in a minute, we can't afford to be complacent about that issue in Illinois due to recent national trends.

So before discussing the voter ID laws themselves and the effect that they have on the right to vote, I want to touch briefly on the



rationale for those laws which has been the prevention of voter fraud.

This is a problem that just doesn't exist. There is virtually no evidence of a voter impersonation in U.S. elections. A 2014 study found a total of 31 credible allegations of voter impersonation between 2000 and 2014, a period in which over a billion votes were cast. And, of course, voter impersonation is the one type of voter fraud that is purportedly addressed by voter ID laws.

We also find that even those reports that are substantiated nearly always turn out to be the result of voter error or error by poll workers rather than a malicious attempt to vote unlawfully and influence an election.

So it's important to understand the absence of a voter -- voter impersonation when we look at the voter ID laws that are purportedly meant to address that issue and the effect it has on civil rights.

Voter ID laws are part of an ongoing strategy nationwide to roll back decades of progress on voting rights. Thirty-four states have



identification requirements at the polls. Seven states have what are called strict voter ID laws under which voters must present one of a limited set of forms of government-issued photo ID in order to cast a regular ballot.

Voter ID laws deprive many voters of their right to vote. They reduce voter participation in direct opposition to our country's overall trend of including more Americans in the Democratic process. Many Americans do not have one of the acceptable forms of ID for voting, and those voters are disproportionately low-income, racial, and ethnic minorities, the elderly, and people with disabilities. So such voters have -- often have difficulty obtaining ID because they can't afford or cannot obtain the underlying documents that are a prerequisite for obtaining government-issued photo IDs.

In addition, obtaining either the voter ID or the underlying documentation to receive that ID is often a major burden in terms of time for people who might need to travel to a government office, for people who might need to research what their requirements are and, again, to collect and obtain



underlying documentation, and a burden for those who actually lack transportation to go to those locations where they can get the ID.

So we see that consistently across the board. Studies show, A, that large numbers of voters lack sufficient ID for those states that have voter ID laws; and, secondly, that lack of ID is unevenly distributed and has dispirit impact on certain groups.

So just to describe a few of the facts that we have from survey data, from academic research, and from court litigation challenges to some of these statutes.

At the national level, a 2006 Friend Center survey showed that 11 percent of American citizens did not have a government-issued photo ID. That same survey showed that elderly and minority individuals as well as those earning less than \$35,000 a year annually were less likely to have government-issued photo IDs.

In the specific state, we see those data replicated over and over again. So, for example, in Texas where the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals recently ruled on a challenge to the voter ID law



there, the courts found that registered Hispanic voters and registered black voters were a 195 percent and 305 percent, respectively, more likely than white voters to lack eligible forms of ID.

In Wisconsin, courts found that approximately 300,000 registered voters or about 9 percent of the state's registered voters lacked eligible ID and that African-American voters in Wisconsin were 1.7 times as likely as white voters to lack eligible ID and Latino voters were 2.3 times as likely as white voters to lack an eligible form of ID for voting.

We find that based on academic research in Indiana, a 2009 survey indicated that 84.2 percent of whites and 78.2 percent of African-Americans had a valid form of ID. And this is -- again, these are findings that are replicated in court case after court case across the board, across states and in research, academic research across the board in many different states.

So, unsurprisingly, given the large number of people who lack a valid form of ID, the voter ID laws have a significant and demonstrable effect on



voter turnout. So, for example, a 2014 study by the GAO found that voter ID laws depressed turnout and have racially disproportionate effects.

Analysis of turnout in the 2008 and 2012 general elections suggested that the implementation of voter ID laws led to a 1.9 percent reduction in turnout in Kansas, for example, and 2.2 percent reduction in turnout in Tennessee. And the reduction in turnout again have racially dispirit impacts with African-Americans showing more of a depressed turnout after implementation of voter ID laws than white voters did. And, again, we see those findings repeated in academic studies nationwide and within the state.

So why should we worry about this in Illinois where we don't have these laws? Well, we see a nationwide trend towards voter suppression. In 2016, 14 states had new restrictions on voting that had not existed before. We see, as Ami Gandhi noted, this sharp increase in rhetoric about voter fraud, about a problem that doesn't exist, and we see the possibility of federal investigations or federal legislation to address, again, the nonexistent problem of in-person voter fraud.



We see that the Department of Justice which had previously taken a strong line against these types of laws is now pulling back from those positions and has, in fact, in Texas, abandoned the federal government position that the Texas voter ID law was intentionally discriminatory on the basis of race.

And here in Illinois, we see voter ID laws and bills pushed virtually every year in the General Assembly for the last seven or eight years. And the type of voter ID laws that are proposed in Illinois are among the most pernicious when you compare them to the voter ID laws in other states.

So, for example, the government IDs that are acceptable in Illinois must have both a photo and a current address. So many photo IDs do not have an address. If you have moved recently and haven't changed the address on your driver's license, you're out of luck. If you are homeless, you're out of luck. The bill would provide for a state-issued ID but imposes very onerous documentation requirements on obtaining it and provides no guidance on how you actually do obtain it, how long it would take, how much it would cost



and so forth.

So it's important here in Illinois for us to recognize the danger of these voter ID laws to civil rights and to continue to hold the line and keep elections in Illinois free and fair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, Ms. Glenberg.

With that, we're going to open it up for the

committee to ask questions of anyone on the panel.

Again, every Committee member is allotted one

question and a follow-up, but depending on our time

because we're going till 9:30 on this first panel,

there may be exceptions at the very end.

So with that, I'll open it up. Are there questions?

MR. KAZMI: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Kazmi. If you could pass the microphone so that folks can ask.

MR. KAZMI: I have two questions. Jacob, I'll start with yours and I'll have one for Ruth and you'll see why it ties in.

You ended with your recommendation was the easiest thing to do is for the General Assembly to amend the law and, in doing so, get rid of the



requirement that, you know, populations under a hundred thousand have electronic polls or books that you had on record.

Two questions, but they're together.

Quick, one, is there a reason why in the rural counties there are not electronic poll books at those smaller polling places? And second, depending on your answer, is that the way to even get past changing the law is giving these more rural locations the ability -- not the ability -- the county election authority providing an electronic book there?

MR. HUEBERT: I assume that they haven't gotten electronic polling books because it's just simpler for them to stay with the status quo and why change if you don't have to, why go out of your way to take on an added expense and a new system if what you're doing seems okay for you and the state isn't making you do it.

If the state were to require that a low population in Illinois counties provide election day registration in polling places, it would have to think about how that's going to be funded. If it turns out that it is a greater expense that some



of these low population counties are prepared to take on, maybe the state would have to provide funding for that or somehow it would have to be figured out. It would have to be paid for.

But I assume that it wouldn't be too incredibly difficult simply because these other states have done it, including -- and most of the states that have done election day registration in polling places are not states with a city nearly as big as Chicago. They're states with lots of rural counties, sparsely populated counties like Iowa. So if they can pull this off, I don't see why Illinois would have trouble doing it if it wanted to.

MR. KAZMI: I know the population and I know the legal test as well, but do you guys or have you done research when you were filing this suit or this claim not necessarily to determine exact cost but how many of those rural polling locations there was?

Because it says, it looks like here in the law, you could have, as long as that county election authority has the ability to register same day, that's fine. Do you have an idea of how many



around this state or how many counties, I guess, have that issue that are under that hundred thousand person population where as long as you register that day at the county election office you're okay?

MR. HUEBERT: Well, that's 82 Illinois counties out of 102 that are under the 100,000 in population. And some of them don't have very many polling places at all because they have so few people. So you think it wouldn't necessarily be that hard to come up with a way for them to do at that limited number of polling places. It's not obvious that it would be that much harder for them than for a high population county with lots and lots of polling places.

MR. KAZMI: Thank you. And then, Ruth, real quick, can I ask that and I'll be done?

Question for you. Me and Joanna were just talking here. This is something that's passionate, that we care greatly about this issue. When you were talking about, one of your recommendations, of course, was the independent commission, but you also shared with ranked voting, are there any countries in the western world that utilize a



1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ranked voting system? We thought of one quickly and so we're wondering if there are others other than what we're thinking.

MS. GREENWOOD: I want to start by adding on to what Mr. Huebert said. I don't think that he is right when he said that the Court can only strike this law down. I litigated in Ohio under federal law in 2012 where they had stopped some people from voting on the weekend before the election and they allowed others. And the result wasn't stop everyone from voting. They said the state had to offer fair and legal voting to everybody on an equal basis using a similar theory.

So while I agree that it would be better that we have election day registration in every polling place across the state, I absolutely disagree with the remedy that this lawsuit is proposing. Why if you say that you get better voting rights and better opportunities in those 20 counties, why don't give those better opportunities to all 102 counties? That's one point.

Secondly, on what you said, you don't even need to look abroad to know that ranked choice voting is used. It is used within America already.



1 MR. KAZMI: Caucus system.

MS. GREENWOOD: Like Cambridge, Massachusetts, has used ranked choice voting to elect its City Council for like 40 years. The New York school board went for a while using ranked choice voting, and through that process they got huge amounts more, you know, people of color on their board at the same time that the City Council wasn't using ranked choice voting and was full of white people.

California, over in San Francisco, has started using ranked choice voting. Minneapolis uses it. And if you want to talk about other countries --

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Greenwood, can you use the microphone?

MS. GREENWOOD: I'm so sorry. And if you want to talk about other countries, my home country of Australia uses ranked choice voting. So, yeah, there are examples all over the place.

MS. GANDHI: Can I chime in to speak about election day registration? To answer your question, at Chicago Lawyers Committee, we have contacted over 100 election administrators, because we have so many different election systems in



Illinois, to specifically ask them about election day registration. We did that so we would have voter education tools in advance of November 8th.

A few highlights from what we learned. Election day registration is available in every county, as I think you know and we've talked about. There are some low population counties that have more than the minimum of one required election day registration site per county who voluntarily decided that they wanted to provide that for their voters.

There are also some low population counties that have invested in tools like electronic poll books and even who are ramping up the use of that investment in that over time, and these all include numerous examples of Republican leaning counties.

There are -- and I also want to mention that the election day registration bill that has since been passed initially -- actually, the initial draft called for a uniform state -- a uniform statewide process of election day registration being available in every polling place in every county. But low population counties



advocated for an ability to opt out of that requirement especially if they had a cost concern, if they weren't able to immediately invest in the technology or staffing resources required to right away implement election day registration in every polling place.

Now that said, there was that cost concern. That's why the political compromise was struck and the bill was passed the way it was in 2015. But that said, in practice, we're seeing many counties including Republican leaning counties that are overtime investing in election day registration and other modernization elections more generally.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. Other questions?

MR. COBB: I have one.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Cobb.

MR. COBB: Appreciate it. My question is for Ms. Greenwood. You talked about some of the barriers to voting for persons in pretrial detention and I guess immediately after release, and I'm interested in hearing more about that because, as I understand it, these are populations that actually can vote under the law, but you're



saying that there are practical barriers that are preventing them from actually exercising that vote.

Could you tell us more about that, please?

MS. GREENWOOD: It was actually Ami that talked about that.

MS. GANDHI: There will also be discussion of this -- my understanding is that there will be a fuller discussion of this in today's program which we really appreciate that experts will be delving into that issue in particular.

But, yes, you're right in what you mentioned. There are large populations, especially in Cook County, but in other counties as well in Illinois of individuals who haven't yet had a trial who haven't been convicted of a crime who are eligible to vote and legally have the right to vote, but in a practical sense, have some limited access to a mail-in ballot process, for example, some limited access to being able to register to vote, but those individuals typically have very little or no access to phones or internet to even check their registration, much less to be able to use the tools that, for example, I would be able to use to register at different times, and certainly



they're not able to register on election day or grace period or anything like that.

So, for some people, the barrier exists because the individual is not yet registered and has very limited abilities or avenues to register or to even check their registration. They may have been registered previously at an address, for example, before being in Cook County Jail, for example, but since then, some of their identifying details have changed and they may not even know if their registration is current or not.

Then you get over that hurdle of whether a person is properly registered or not, and people don't always know about the ability to receive a mail-in ballot and they're only allowed to apply for and receive mail-in ballot on particular days due to the security protocols in the jail.

There are examples of election officials who are aware of those different barriers and who are working with Department of Corrections, for example, and voters who are most directly affected by this to try to streamline the process and make it more clear. There is voter registration happening in Cook County Jail on Saturdays, for



example, by different civic organizations, leading up to the suburban municipal elections happening here on April 4th where there are numerous individuals in pretrial detention who are eligible to vote for that election.

So there are some signs of progress, but it requires a lot of coordination given the security, logistical, and different bureaucratic hurdles that are involved.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Buys.

MS. BUYS: Thank you to all the panelists. I appreciate your remarks this morning.

A couple of you referred to some of the recent rhetoric about voter fraud and, in particular, we've had statements by our President about people who are not authorized to vote voting. So I'm wondering if you're seeing any evidence here in Illinois of non U.S. citizens who have voted when they're not supposed to.

MS. GREENWOOD: I'm happy to jump in. I am aware of zero evidence of that ever happening in Illinois. I just think it's not a problem. I myself am not yet a citizen, and there's no way I'm going to put my ability to become a citizen in



jeopardy by going and voting which would be an offense which would lead to deportation.

MS. GANDHI: We've also seen in our engagement with immigrant communities and civic organizations who focus on immigrant engagement that there's a widespread understanding by immigrant voters and by noncitizens of the penalties involved for people who are ineligible going to the polls or even registering. And so there's a widespread understanding that it's a deportable offense for a noncitizen to vote or to register.

People in mixed status families have a visceral understanding of that, people who are involved in the immigrant community in a variety of ways. So when there are voter registration drives or a get-out-to-vote effort, all of that, there's a very clear understanding that it doesn't make sense for anyone involved who are not citizens to subject themselves to that kind of scrutiny or punishment by registering or by voting.

We've also seen the flip side of even people getting ensnared in that conversation and then the rhetoric and fear even who are eligible immigrant citizen voters. So we've seen instances



in every election, including in the November 2016 election, of eligible citizen immigrant voters being made to feel like they don't belong, being improperly turned away from the polls, being questioned about their citizenship. This over time has affected African-American voters who there are instances of improperly being turned away from the polls or questioned about their right to be there.

And we're also seeing immigrant voters, people who are perceived to be immigrants, Muslim voters, people who are perceived of being Muslim also being improperly turned away from the polls or intimidated by -- it could be police, election workers or fellow voters at the polls.

MS. BUYS: I do have one follow-up question for that. So I have read a few cases about immigrants who have voted improperly, and it seems to me that it happened in part because of the Motor Voter registration, that maybe there was some confusion or there was a conversation at that point where, you know, the wrong box was checked and the person became automatically registered.

Is there any concern that there should be changes in the voter registration process, whether



it's Motor Voter or other processes so that that confusion doesn't happen?

MS. GANDHI: I will kick it off and turn it over to Ruth. So there's not that problem in the Illinois system right now, but I can tell you that in conversations about proposals moving forward, about how to modernize our voter registration system in Illinois, there's a talk of automatic voter registration, as I mentioned earlier. There's a bill that is growing with bipartisan momentum and support that's before the Illinois legislature right now, and the conversation has been very specific and focused on how to make sure there's reliable information about citizenship when other state government databases are being used to add to the voter registration rolls.

So those conversations and the tooling of the legislation and eventually hopefully the implementation is being done with that concern in mind, absolutely, to make sure we safeguard the integrity and the accuracy of the voting rolls.

MS. GREENWOOD: I should add that the first question on the voter registration form whether it's the federal NVRA or the local one is are you a



United States citizen, and that's available in multiple languages throughout the state. So it's pretty clear. I've done voter registration drives and had people who say, the answer to that question is no. I'm like, okay, I'll take that form back.

I should also add that in California, they have an automatic voter registration bill that would mean that when you interact with the DMV you automatically become registered if you're able to verify that you are citizen, if you have provided some evidence of citizenship.

But they also have a whole training program for their DMV workers to make it very clear that the error, if somebody is registered incorrectly and they're not yet a citizen, the error is on the DMV worker because they're supposed to be checking. You know, it's up to the government to police who is getting into the polls and making sure that it's fair. I don't think it's fair to put it on, you know, an immigrant who doesn't really understand necessarily what's going on. The DMV worker who does this all day every day should know the rules and be able to make sure that citizens are able to register if they're citizens.



CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Wortham, you had a question?

MS. WORTHAM: Yes. You sort of came to reach a point that I was going to ask you about, and that is, is there any way to substantively describe the photo ID from other forms of ID that makes this particular form of ID problematic other than other types like Social Security and so on? And I think you said the question, are you an American citizen. But are there other elements to the voter ID that poses a problem that other voter's ID does not?

I'm trying to make the connection between voter ID and fraud and misuse of voter ID, and I'm having a hard time on that.

MS. GLENBERG: I'm not completely -- I'm not sure I completely understand the question. Is the question why -- is the question whether it's harder to get a photo ID than other forms of ID?

MS. WORTHAM: There is apparently in the discourse the assumption that those who support voter ID, their rationale is you want to prevent voter fraud, and our response to that is there is no evidence of voter fraud; therefore, we do not require or should not have a requirement of voter



ID.

I'm asking is there something substantively different about asking voters to have identification in this context of voting than identification in other context such as Social Security, Medicare, other -- I've got a pocket book full of cards walking around with all these things.

What is there about this particular form of ID that is so problematic?

MS. GLENBERG: I think that what you would hear from supporters of these laws is that the reason why you need photo ID is so that the poll worker can look at the photo and look at the person and see if they're the same person.

In fact, we know that people are not all that great at doing that and particularly where you are looking sort of cross racially at a photo of someone who is not your race or a person who is not your race, you will have a harder time matching up that photo to that person. I think that -- I'm still not sure how to answer your question.

MS. GANDHI: I want to share a story and turn it over to Ruth. I want to share one example of a voter who contacted us and why he was not able to



have an ID.

So he completed a sentence. He was leaving incarceration. He left incarceration. He found a place to live. He found a job, against a lot of odds. He had a work ID to get into his workplace which had his picture on it, but it didn't have an address, and so it didn't qualify for certain ID requirements that he needed. He tried to get a state ID and was told to get a state ID, I mean, regardless of the cost which is also an unfair burden on some people and some people liken that to a modern day poll tax, but regardless of the cost, he was willing to pay it.

He was told that to get the state ID, he needed to have a Social Security card or a birth certificate. He did not have a Social Security card. He tried to get a birth certificate from another state where he was born. To get the birth certificate, he had to fill out a notarized application. The notary public wouldn't notarize the application because he didn't have a state ID to show that he was who he said he was. And so this individual spent a lot of time with us and in person and over the phone trying to figure this



out, and there was not a functional way that he could meet the requirements even though he was trying to do everything he could to follow all the rules. He specifically engaged and invested in the cost required. There was just no way under the current rules. I will turn it over to Ruth.

MS. GREENWOOD: I wanted to add with your question, I think you are asking about forms of ID that are required in photo ID bills. We don't have a photo ID bill here in Illinois, but upstairs in Wisconsin, they have photo ID. They have a very restrictive list of what you can use.

employee ID that had your photo on it, that's enough to say here's my name, here's my photo, I am who I say I am, I'm stopping impersonation fraud. But that was not allowed in Wisconsin. In fact, in Wisconsin, they said you had to have an expiring date on your ID. So current members of the military have IDs with expiring dates, but veterans don't have expiring dates. There's no expiring date on being a veteran. So veterans were not able to use their IDs in order to vote.

So I think you hit on a really good point



which is that these photo ID laws, it really matters how they -- and what gets included.

Already there is a requirement under the Help America Vote Act, federal law, that when you register, the state needs either the last four of your social or a driver's license number to be able to match you to make sure that you are who you say you are. So identification is already part of the process by federal law. Adding a photo ID requirement on top is just restricting who can access the polls. Exactly as Ami said.

And Ami has similar cases out of Wisconsin where you had people who were born in the south during segregated hospitals. So they didn't have a birth certificate. They were born at home. They weren't able to then use their birth certificate to get a state ID. So you're seeing these interactions with historical discrimination.

So I think you're right that there are real problems with photo ID laws and the way that they're written and who gets included in and excluded.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. We're running out of time. I do want to get to the last two



questions. Ms. Rodriguez and Ms. Haleem, if you can ask your questions in succession and then we'll end with the answers.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Mine is for Ms. Glenberg. Of the 31 credible allegations of voter fraud over a span of 14, 15 years, were any of these allegations tied to Illinois? And if so, were they due or caused by a systemic failure or what were the causes? If you can just expand a little bit about that and what steps were taken to remedy that situation.

My question is also about voter MS. HALEEM: So because this question keeps coming up and it's made to sound so simple, why wouldn't you want So I'm going to approach it from -- I'm an ID. going to give the proponents of it the benefit of the doubt and say that, okay, they want it for a good reason. I would like to know the reason in the sense that if you think -- if they think that it's the wrong person, why wouldn't just a photo be sufficient? Why would it -- what are the elements of the requirements for the voter ID and what is the justification for each of those elements is what I would want to know?



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And the other thing is as far as -- it would be great to have numbers about people who end up voting without having a registration card handy. Like when I go to a polling place, they pull up my voter registration card first or, you know, somewhere where they check me in. What is the size of the population that's not required, you know, either mobile voting? I'm really ignorant about that. If you can expand on it.

MS. GLENBERG: So the actual requirements for the voter ID vary from state to state, and I think that many of the requirements don't really have a justification.

so in the bill that is currently pending in the Illinois General Assembly and that's been proposed year after year, for example, there is the requirement that the photo ID have both a photo and an address even though, again, many IDs don't have an address and you would think that, first of all, the address could be independently proven and, second of all, you demonstrated your address at the time that you voted. And if the point of the photo ID is to show that you are who you say you are, why wouldn't the photo be sufficient.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Another requirement that is in the Illinois bill that you see in some other states is that the photo ID be unexpired and valid. Again, not clear how that's relevant to the ID function of the photo ID, and particularly valid is often not defined. If your driver's license is suspended because of a traffic violation, does that make it less of an identification?

So, again, requirements that really don't seem to have much connection in reality.

Then you have the state-issued card which the Illinois bill and which in many states you can get if you don't have a valid photo ID, but the documentation for that, again, not always completely justified. So first of all, you have to provide either a photo ID which sort of seems a little redundant and ridiculous or a nonphoto ID that contains both your name and your date of birth. Again, not clear where the relevance of that is.

You need a utility bill, rental agreement, a tax return to verify your address and also to independently verify your voter registration. well, if you registered to vote, you have already



verified your address. And if you are not the head of your household, if you're living with families or others and they receive the utility bills and the rental agreement is in their name, then how do you provide that documentation?

So I think the answer to your question is that there are many ID requirements in this proposed Illinois bill but also in other states that don't have that rationale.

I actually don't know the question -- the answer to the other question about whether any of those instances took place in Illinois. That's something that I would be happy to look up and to submit to the committee unless someone else knows the answer to that question.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: And we will accept any written testimony both today and before writing the recommendation.

So Ms. Glenberg, Mr. Huebert, Ms. Gandhi, and Ms. Greenwood, thank you so much for your testimony today. We will take a ten-minute break and reconvene at 9:45. With that, this panel is closed.

(Off the record at 9:34 a.m.)



. .

(On the record at 9:49 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you once again for those of you who were here for the previous panels and then we have a new panel on voting and incarceration.

Before we get started, I would like for those Committee members who arrived after the beginning of the first panel, if you could say your name and where you come from.

MR. GARCIA: Rick Garcia. I am with LGBT Impact and I am from Chicago.

MS. WORTHAM: Anne Wortham, Associate Professor of Sociology at Illinois State University.

MR. NEVELS: Malik Nevels, Executive Director for the Illinois African American Coalition.

MR. HOWARD: Bill Howard from Chicago State University.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. And just for a reminder for the Committee members, you need to use your microphone. And then there is one for our panelists as well. If you could please use the microphone when you give your testimony.

So with that, I'm going to introduce each one of our panel members and we do have rules.

1 I'll announce those rules again. There's always 2 exceptions and we're going to use that today 3 because our first speaker, Ms. Christina Rivers, 4 has a commitment that she let us know about 5 beforehand. So what we're going to do is when Ms. Rivers gives her testimony, we'll jump into a 6 7 ten-minute question and answer or five-minute question and answer session with her. She'll go do 8 what she has to do. and then we'll continue with 9 10 the rest of the panelists. 11 So with that, let me introduce -- I just 12 introduced Ms. Christina Rivers with

introduced Ms. Christina Rivers with

DePaul University's Political Science Department.

We also have Michelle Mbekeani-Wiley with the

Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law. We
have Ms. Cara Smith with the Office of the Cook

County Sheriff. We have Mr. Nasir Blackwell with
the Inner-City Muslim Action Network. And we have

Mr. Marlon Chamberlain with the Community Renewal

Society. Thank you for coming.

We'll start with Ms. Christina Rivers. By the way, you have 10 to 12 minutes for your presentation. I do have cards here that will announce when you have five minutes, three minutes,



13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

one minute, and then the end. And, then, again with Ms. Rivers we'll start with question and answer right after your testimony.

MS. RIVERS: Thank you, everyone. Again, I'm Christina Rivers. I'm an Associate Professor of Political Science at DePaul University, and I'm very, very honored to be here and to share what I'm learning about problems with respect to felon disenfranchisement and prison-based gerrymanders. I also appreciate you letting me go early. I have to go back to school. Today is our last day of class of the winter quarter. So it's not exactly the best class to suspend, even though I'm sure my students would have loved it. And I'm also thankful for this opportunity because I will be discussing this hearing when I go back to class, the class on mass incarceration. So I can't think of a better way to end my quarter. So thank you.

what I'm going to talk about again today is the political implications of mass incarceration on democracy. So just to give some brief context. I put a slide up here.

The initial founding era vision of voting was very restrictive, and as you can see up there,



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

there were several conditions that people had to have in order to be able to even vote. And so all of those conditions in the white have now been changed, except for that one in the orange, and those that I have in orange denote those things that I'm going to talk about that have a racial implication.

So of all of those conditions, all of those restrictions, none exist anymore except for felon disenfranchisement.

There's some interesting principles behind -- we just had a discussion here at the table here, you know, why do we have these laws that disenfranchise those who are either serving a sentence or have completed their sentences? The origins are really quite old, depending who you read. They go back at least to the Medieval concept, some would say earlier even to Ancient Greece, to this notion of civil death, in other words, the extent to which one commits an offense against another person or against society. Their political personhood is suspended while they are serving out that punishment.

This was then reinforced by Rousseau's



social contract theory which basically is a contract with each other. So those are sort of the principles of some of the disenfranchisement laws.

There's also the pragmatics. Those initial disenfranchisement laws reinforced the original founding era limitations on popular democracy. Several decades later, the 14th Amendment actually reinforces this. In Section 2, there is a little clause in there that allows for the suspension of voting rights for people who have committed crimes.

And so what ends up happening is there's a reinforced connection between race, between laws behind political behavior and citizenship and political power. And so these slides come from a longer talk that I have that talks about the connections and the reinforcement of felon disenfranchisement laws through the era of Jim Crowe. I'm going to assume we all know about that. So I skipped past that.

And so I just wanted to put this in context of the war on drugs which becomes a war on equality, in particular, political equality. So most of us know that the U.S. has about 2.7,



2.3 million, depending who you talk to, folks in jail or in prisons. 6.1 million people totally under penal supervision, and there are profound racial disparities. You can see by those raw numbers in the right how really profound the racial disparities are with respect to the representation of African-Americans in the criminal justice system, in the incarcerated state.

So that's -- I'm not a big person on numbers. That's probably all the numbers I'm going to give you for the most part.

And so what this means is for all those folks who are either incarcerated and serving time for a felony, not in jail, for all those folks serving time in jail -- I'm sorry, in prison serving time or who are under the penal provisions, this amounts to about 2.5 percent of our total population.

There are 48 states that prevent those who are serving their sentence from voting. The only two states that allow people in prison to vote are Maine and Vermont. They vote in absentia. So they turn in absentee ballots. Puerto Rico actually allows those who are incarcerated to vote as well,



and they create -- they set up a polling place in the prison. Outside of that, the vast majority of the states in this country do not allow people to vote while they're serving a sentence.

The four states that I highlighted there show -- exemplify the sort of torturing attempts to disenfranchise and then reinfranchise. So, for example, a few years ago Iowa had pretty much a permanent ban on felons in voting even when they got out. That was changed to give them more of a chance to re-register to vote and then it was changed again to make it permanent.

Florida went through a similar situation. And in Florida's case, it was over the course of about three years.

Kentucky went through a similar situation. In Kentucky's case, the right to vote was restored and then restricted again in a matter of months.

And Maryland has an extremely tortured case of going back and forth and back and forth on this, but, finally, those who have served their time in Maryland can vote. You can see this is a very moving target and most of the back and forth on these laws run along strictly partisan lines.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The gist is in four states you can see that over 20 percent of African-Americans are disenfranchised due to felony convictions. And that is absolutely profound.

And so I'm going to leave it to you to read the rest of these numbers, but this is a serious problem with respect to representation and race in this country.

So the good news is that Illinois, as we were talking about just a few minutes ago, is one of the more generous states. So folks who have served their sentence are eligible to vote and register to vote immediately upon release. They can still be doing parole, probation. They can be under supervision, but they are immediately eligible to vote upon release as soon as they walk They do have to register, and we've already out. discussed -- the preceding panel discussed some of the problems that can come along with registering if they don't have proper ID and become registered. But Illinois has a very generous approach in a relative sense to felon disenfranchisement compared to other states.

So with that, I'm going to move on to this



other little thing called prison-based gerrymanders which is another thing that is sort of hidden in plain sight. It has negative implications for race and representation. And so prison gerrymanders are the practice of the U.S. Census counting prisoners at the prison address and lawmakers then counting prisoners in those -- in districts that have prisoners, counting those prisoners as part of the district's population, keeping in mind that these prisoners can't vote. So they're sort of filler.

And the quote that I have up there relates to three-fifths clause because this operates in a very similar way as the three-fifths clause back when it existed. And so that quote that I have up there is a critic of the three-fifths clause in response to Jefferson's land in the 1800s where he basically says, Great men never lack supporters who manufacture their own voters. He's not talking about Thomas Jefferson's children or his slaves reproducing with respect to children. He's talking about this idea where slaves can sort of manufacture their own voters by having these bodies of slaves counting for them in terms of districting, electoral college allocation, and



other allocations that are related to population.

And so the practice of counting prisoners at prison addresses and then locales counting them in their electoral districts creates what many scholars have called either phantom constituents, zombie constituents, ghost constituents. I'm taking these, by the way, all from titles of articles that have been written about this topic, although I wish I could have come up with that language on my own.

So, in other words, you have these bodies who are in prisons who are counting for someone's political representation, but not theirs.

And so this conflicts with state's -typically states have what they call usual
residence rules. So you have situations where
other people are not living at home, but they can
still count themselves at home or the census counts
them at their regular home residence. The common
example of that are college students who live in
dormitories or younger children who may be in a
boarding school or the military or people who work
outside of the state or outside of the country.
And so most states allow the people who are being



counted to determine where they want to be counted or whoever is filling out that census form on behalf of their household.

States are not compelled to count prisoners at a prison address. And so the localities that do that in some states run aground of the state's usual residence rules. And as with states, it differs. There's many different types of usual residence rules as there are states.

There's also the potential of these prison gerrymanders to conflict with the 14th Amendment's equal protection clause and with the principle of one-person-one-vote because districts that count prisoners are empowered with these bodies that adjacent districts don't have if they don't have a prison. And so it skews local representation which are typically small districts.

So in a very real sense, there's a reinvigoration of the three-fifths clause, this time not strictly targeting African-Americans, but also it's at a one-to-one ratio. Again, the problems here with prison gerrymanders are manifest.

I got a link here. I won't have time to



show this now, but the people who want to see how this works, because it's kind of a tough thing to follow, if you just Google Anamosa, Iowa, there's a nice little three-minute video that shows you how this works.

Now Illinois Representative LaShawn Ford has put forth a bill to end this practice. It was tabled and it was tabled, in part, because there were downstate legislators who pushed back against it because they didn't want to lose the funding that sometimes comes with prisoners who are in the prisons, who are in their districts.

And so the jury is out on how much of an effect there is on funding allocation. There is some experts that say there is no effect. I think that has to do with federal funding, but there are other studies that show that there are disproportionate funding effects at the state level. And so there's that funding inequality as well as political inequality.

So the conclusion is that racial disparities in the criminal justice system lead to racial disparities in political representation.

I will leave it to the rest. The folks



can read what's up in here. What I really want to point out is the U.S. really deviates sharply from other developed democracies with respect to how many people we disenfranchise, with respect to this practice of prison gerrymandering, and certainly with respect to just the shear number of people that we incarcerate.

And so the system of mass incarceration has profound political implications. While it's very encouraging that there's much more light being shed on the system of mass incarceration as it exists now, in my view as a political scientist, there's been insufficient discussion of these political ramifications. And so I'm that much more grateful to have the opportunity to talk about those problems here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much,
Professor Rivers. Because we have a larger panel
here today, we want to respect time, we'll open it
up to either two questions or seven minutes of
question and answers, whichever comes first.
Questions?

MR. COPELAND: One of the things I was wondering is given the host of challenges faced by



formerly incarcerated persons attempting to rehabilitate and re-enter society, it seems that voting access might be pretty low on their list of priorities, which is not to say that it's not at all important. In fact, I think the opposite is exactly the true.

So I'm curious if you're aware in your social science research of empirical data or even anecdotal data about how valuable people attempting to reintegrate consider this to be. And then if there are other suggestions you might have with regard to how reinfranchisement might actually be used, I mean, for right now as a transition from where things are to where ideally they could or should be of a way of promoting people to be able to reintegrate and have some say as a citizen.

MS. RIVERS: I am happy to say that there's a great deal of interest on the part of people who are incarcerated either in jails or in prisons.

I'm so glad you asked that question.

I actually have been teaching about this in a class that I taught at Stateville Correctional Center last spring. I now have what's called a think tank that continues those discussions. And



so I had them read my paper because that's what professors do, right? And they were very interested in both the felon disenfranchisement piece and the prison gerrymandering piece. And so they actually came up with a survey about this. And this started just from a side conversation that they had with each other while they were waiting for food one day when they were talking about what we had discussed.

And so of the poll -- and so far I have gotten a small number. I gave out 50 copies of this poll. Twenty-seven survived a major, major lockdown. So I'm talking about 27 responses to 50 polls. Of the 27 responses, 16 did not know that they could get their right to vote restored upon release. Eleven did. That's actually a higher response than we suspected. So that shows you there is an awareness that 11 out of the 27 did know that they could be -- have their voting rights restored.

In response to the question, how important is the right to vote, 25 out of 26 said very important. These were paper surveys that were circulated around the blocks. I did not hand these



out. The inmates with whom I worked handed these out.

To the question, are you aware of the process required in Illinois to regain the right to vote after incarceration, here's where the problem is, 80 percent said no. So you have this expressed interest, but 80 percent said they weren't aware of the right.

And in response to the question of how likely would you vote after released, 96 percent said very likely. This is an institution where most of these people are not going to get out.

And so, again, that's a very small study, but I think it's very illustrative. I do know of other organizations in other states of people who have been incarcerated who are now working to get their state laws changed to make it easier for them to register to vote and also to get rid of more Draconian felon disenfranchising laws that exist in other states like Georgia and Alabama that are much worse than here.

So the interest is there. The activism is there. It's just starting to really build up.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. Mr. Kazmi has a



1 question.

MR. KAZMI: Ms. Rivers, just a question. If you said this, forgive me. Have there been any lawsuits on equal protection grounds of the 14th Amendment for political gerrymandering?

MS. RIVERS: Yes. The last -- the one that I'm most familiar with, and I can be corrected by my colleagues here, the one that stands -- that comes out to my mind is Vieth versus Jubelirer. I'm not sure if I'm pronouncing that correctly.

MR. KAZMI: What was the first one?

MS. RIVERS: Vieth, V-i-e-t-h. I believe it was a 2003 case. And that was where the Supreme Court held that political gerrymandering was not an equal protection violation. And so it gave states the right to engage in political gerrymandering.

I know there have been some decisions since then, but, to me, that is sort of the benchmark on where we stand now.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: We actually have time for one more question. Ms. Haleem?

MS. HALEEM: My question would be -- so the concept of not allowing incarcerated individuals to vote is Medieval. It was initially theirs. So how



many -- how well is that known? Is that common knowledge for, you know, many of us, and if we -- if Americans knew about that, would they have a problem with that? And has that -- I'm just asking. How do we go about correcting it?

MS. RIVERS: I don't think it's common knowledge that Americans know that we have this felon disenfranchisement practice that is so deeply rooted in Medieval law. I honestly don't think that's common knowledge.

I can't answer about what -- I'm not sure what the response would be. I can guess that there would be a fair amount of the population that thinks that that's ridiculous. I can also guess that there would be a pretty good portion of the population that says, hey, you do the time -- or the crime, you do the time, and that means you can't vote. That's fine.

what I am noticing over the past ten years or so since this issue of mass incarceration has nearly bubbled up to the surface is that there's much -- there's an increasing amount of openness and recognition that this is a system that needs to be completely overhauled.



Anecdotally speaking, when I talk to people about disenfranchisement laws and prison gerrymanders, they're not happy with that. But I'm also tending to talk to people in academic circles or conferences, probably kind of a biased crew, but there are even people who would take a more conservative approach to punishment that I think would probably still have an issue with the derivation of these practices and the continuation of them, especially recognizing that to have somebody released who served their time where they're supposedly re-entering society but they can't vote is second-class citizenship. There's no way around that.

MS. HALEEM: So my follow-up question or comment would be that the same concept applies to a right to citizenship, that one cannot -- the right of citizenship can't be taken away, and that sounds so obvious to people. So wouldn't the right to vote or participate in civic society be also something that cannot be taken away?

MS. RIVERS: That's certainly been my argument. And most of the people that I've made that argument to agree to that, but there's also others who would

say that -- who look at the commission of the crime in a more permanent way, that tend to connect that particular action to that person for the rest of their lives. And many people would argue, well, to continue to punish them like that is also a violation of the 8th Amendment, against cruel and unusual punishment.

I think that these two issues have had so

I think that these two issues have had so little attention that a lot of folks are still right now making up their minds about it. But I sense and from what I have understood from people who have responded to me about my work and others who do my work, there seems to be much more openness to be considering these laws than there has been in the past which I find helpful.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much,
Professor Rivers, for your testimony. With that,
we know you have to leave. We appreciate you being
here and sharing with us.

With that, we're going to go then four in our row with our speakers. And Ms. Mbekeani-Wiley, then you have the floor. You have 12 minutes.

MS. MBEKEANI-WILEY: My name is
Michelle Mbekeani-Wiley, and I am the Community



Justice staff attorney at the Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law.

So for the past year, I have worked alongside the Cook County Department of Corrections and Cook County Clerk David Orr's office to increase voter turnout at the Cook County Jail.

Just to provide some context since people don't know. The Cook County Jail is overwhelmingly black. So when I speak of barriers to voting while detained at Cook County Jail, I'm speaking about barriers that have a disproportionate impact on black people and specifically black people living in Chicago.

So prior to the November 8, 2016, presidential election, I led an effort to register individuals detained at the Cook County Jail. This included going to the jail every weekend and registering individuals detained in person. We registered over 1,000 people. And with more volunteers and competence, we could have done more because there was certainly a desire to register to vote within the jail. That kind of speaks to the earlier statement of whether that's a first priority, but I can certainly attest that in the



jail a lot of people were very eager to register to vote even though they were in a very stressful time of awaiting trial.

An overwhelming majority of the individuals who registered were young, black men. When I say young, individuals under the age of 25. Through this effort of registering individuals has exposed some varying obstacles that these individuals encounter when they're trying to register to vote. The three primarily being access to Social Security Number, access to an address, an uncertainty of whether they are even eligible to vote, which was touched on earlier.

I'll first go into the Social Security
Number. I know that that was kind of addressed in
the earlier panel. So whether registering a person
online or by mail with the Social Security Number,
the last four digits are required. And if a person
doesn't have that number ingrained in their mind
while they're detained or don't have access to it,
they can't register to vote. We found that
actually a lot of young people never new their
Social Security Number.

Now this was already addressed so I won't



go too much, but I think what was already addressed was how hard it is to recover your Social Security Number within this very building. You need a birth certificate or a passport. That's just for citizenship. Then you also need other documents verifying identity. And so these are documents that people in Cook County Jail do not have access to.

So to kind of give a story of how this plays out, we had younger individuals. We found that younger individuals under the age of 21 never knew their Social Security Number. Many had entered actually through the juvenile temporary detention center and aged out while awaiting trial and were now at the Cook County Jail as adults.

So we had one young woman who entered into the juvenile temporary detention center at the age of 16. Upon turning 18, she was transferred into Cook County Jail and is still awaiting trial. Like many 16-year-olds, when she entered, she did not know her Social Security Number. Now as an 18-, 19-year-old who is eligible to vote, I was unable to register her to vote because she never knew her Social Security Number. She was also disconnected



from her family and that being that she was in custody, there was no way for her to actually go in person and to recover her Social Security Number so she could vote, a right that she obtains while still awaiting trial. So that young woman was unable to vote absentee ballot this past November.

I speak on this story because David Orr's office has done a great job of ensuring that there is an absentee ballot for people in Cook County Jail. They have partnered with the Sheriff's Department for years on this effort, but registering people to vote is still a barrier that we have encountered because they don't have access to the necessary documents.

Another issue we found was establishing residency, and I think this is somewhere that we can actually make some progress if we tweak the policies that we have with our Board of Elections. So the nature of our overburdened court system that we have in Cook County and limitless use of continuances has resulted in various individuals awaiting trial for, say, over four years. As a result, many individuals at Cook County Jail see the jail as their residence and it is where they



receive their mail and where they spend their days and so forth.

But just this past weekend, I tried to register a young black man who could not recollect any address he had because he had been awaiting trial in Cook County Jail for six years. He had lived inside Cook County Jail for six years, and this is actually a longer amount of time than a college student would spend on their own campus. Therefore, he was greatly upset that a facility that he had spent more than a quarter of his life at could not be used as a residence for purposes of registering to vote.

In the past, I registered these types of individuals as homeless voters and used a jail address as their shelter. But upon doing that, I was quickly notified by the Chicago Board of Elections that that was not permitted because the jail could not be considered a shelter.

This is very problematic because we find that we're not permitting people to use the jail as their address regardless of how many years that individual has actually spent time within the facility.



9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The prohibition of using the jail as a shelter for voter registration even in instances where the individual has continuously been detained there for more than three years which is, in fact, longer than the average amount of years people spend in IDOC for gerrymandering purposes is in stark contrast with states even like Florida. Florida allows their people to use a vacant lot or even a park bench or two street corners, an intersection, as a residence or address for shelter purposes when they register to vote.

Yet in Illinois, the Chicago Board of Elections would not permit individuals that were in Cook County Jail for over three years to use that residence where they receive mail as a residence for purposes of registering to vote.

As a result, we had several individuals that were almost in this kind of residential exile because they could not recollect their last address from five years ago, four years ago which is reasonable. They did not have any family ties or anyone even living in that address anymore, and yet they couldn't use the jail as a shelter for homeless purposes as a homeless voter. This is



also in stark contrast with the state's own policy of permitting college students who use their school address which was stated earlier and, again, it's also in stark contrast with the U.S. Census that says that people that are incarcerated in IDOC use that as a residence for purposes of districting but don't let the very same people that are in jail, and the only distinct factor is they have not been convicted.

So this prohibition puts the detained population which is predominantly black in residential exile and barring them from the opportunity to register vote and in turn vote as they await their trial, a right they maintain until they're convicted.

Now the final thing which was also touched on earlier was these myths of whether you could vote. Again, I've been able to interface with hundreds of people, speak with them and also trying to convince them that they have the right to vote. Both individuals detained and correctional officers were surprised that people with felony convictions retained the right to vote. I frequently had to convince detainees that they could vote despite



their criminal history.

Last summer, I registered a black man who was 64 years old. He had never registered to vote before because he thought his felony convictions barred him from doing so. Though that may have been true in Illinois in the past, that's far from the truth today. We have one of the more acceptable ways of voting for parole and probation. A lot of them were surprised about that.

And in response when I told him, he stated, there should be a way to let people know with felony convictions about the new laws that impact their right to vote.

In Illinois, only -- so we created a poster and we put them in all eight divisions of Cook County Jail prior to the November election informing them that if you are registered to vote in the State of Illinois, even if you have felony convictions, even if you're on parole or probation, even if you're serving a misdemeanor conviction, you can still vote. The only people in Illinois who cannot vote are the ones who are currently serving a sentence for felony convictions.

So this was done through both, you know,



the Cook County -- sorry, the Cook County Clerk's office as well as correctional officers, and there is definitely a joint effort to ensure that people were informed of their right to vote.

So I want to leave with one last thing.

We cannot stop with just doing these local efforts.

It has to be a statewide effort because I found
that even though Cook County is the largest jail in
the state, if not the nation, we have other county
jails that don't have these volunteer efforts
coordinated to ensure that their populations have
the right to vote.

As of last check nationally, which we were recently featured in Slate Magazine, Cook County Jail and D.C. are one of the only jails in the country that have a coordinated absentee ballot effort. So it's good to know that within this county that we're ahead of the trends, but if we're as a state looking at the rights of people to vote while in jail, it does need to be a statewide coordinated effort.

In conclusion, given that incarceration disproportionately impacts black communities in this state, the state must ensure that the



incarceration does not become a new polling tax for black and brown communities. You must acknowledge the inevitable consequences of incarceration, of being exiled from your community and personal identifying information such as your Social Security Number and last address.

we must account for the disproportionately young black and brown people in our jails that entered into custody through the juvenile system and have been awaiting trial for so long that they've transitioned into legal adulthood while in custody before remembering the last four digits of their Social Security Number.

And we also should note that barriers for voting while behind bars will always have a disproportionate impact on black and brown people so long as contact with the justice system disproportionately impacts black and brown people. Our boards of election must in turn aggressively combat the myths that individuals with felony convictions can't vote in the state when, in fact, even individuals who are still on parole and probation can vote.

And, finally, as a state, we need to make



sure that access to voter registration does not mirror historical Jim Crowe tactics that bars black and brown communities from polling places. So when the right to vote is retained, many barriers that are imposed by the state diminish that right and is a civil rights violation.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much for that.

Ms. Smith, you have 12 minutes. You have the floor.

MS. SMITH: Good morning. I will not use 12 minutes, but I'll give you some context for this conversation about what the population of the Cook County Jail looks like.

First of all, we are very proud of our engagement in the voter registration and facilitating absentee voting. The Sheriff is very committed to doing that.

People stay in the Cook County Jail for a very long time. There's been a lot of conversation about not only mass incarceration, but bond reform which impacts predominantly our minority population, which is 90 percent of the people in the Cook County Jail are minority. 95 percent of them are pre-trial, and only about 30 percent are



maximum security detainees. So the majority of people are in the Cook County Jail because they quite simply can't afford to post whatever bond has been set.

Today, we have 7500 people behind the walls and another 2400 people on electronic monitoring. And we have been focusing on how long people stay with us. I want to share just a couple of statistics that are relevant to this conversation.

We track lots of bits of data in the jail.

We are the largest single site jail in the country
meaning LA and Rikers may have larger populations
totally, but we have all of our population in one
96 acre compound at 26th and California. We track
people that we call turn-arounds. These are people
that spend -- these are low level offenders, again,
the vast, vast majority of minorities who spend all
of their ultimate prison sentence in the Cook
County Jail. So that by the time they are
sentenced to a term of imprisonment, they already
served it.

Last year alone, just under 1200 people served their entire prison sentence in the Cook



County Jail and, in addition to that, served an extra 244 years of incarceration beyond what they needed to satisfy their sentence. 244 extra years of incarceration. Shameful statistics any way you look at them, and statistics that bear the need to continue the reforms that are ongoing, and I think Illinois is in a leadership position to be abolishing cash bond and infusing justice into the way we incarcerate and manage our criminal justice system.

only about 25 to 30 percent of our overall population ultimately serve a prison sentence. The majority return back to the community. And so these efforts that are underway both to advocate, to educate, and to empower individuals that are in our custody to engage in our Democratic process is -- it's a really terrific sort of intersection to allow these efforts to continue, and it's something that we feel very proud to be a part of.

So I think that's the way I can help this conversation is just by painting the picture of what the population of the jail looks like and reinforcing our commitment to continue to be part of these efforts to empower those in our custody.



Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, Ms. Smith, for that testimony. We appreciate it.

Mr. Blackwell, the floor is yours. You have 12 minutes.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you for inviting me here to speak. My name is Michael Nasir Blackwell. I'm with the Inner-City Muslim Action Network. IMAN is an organization that fosters health, wellness, and healing in the inner city of Chicago by cultivating the arts, operating a holistic health center, and by organizing. I am one of their organizers.

I served 24 and a half years inside of the Illinois Department of Corrections. Prior to my incarceration, when I went inside County Jail, there was a state election, and of course I would like to vote. And I was adamantly told by jail officials, you do not have the right to vote. Okay. That was fine.

I received the reversal about Illinois

Supreme Court in 1996 during the presidential election. Once again, I requested an opportunity to vote in the Will County Jail, and I was told I did not have the right to vote, especially now, now



that I've been convicted of a felony. So before is because I was charged and detained. Now because I'm convicted of a felony and I'm detained in the county jail, the reason why I don't have a right to vote.

So it's very important for this question to be brought forward to the Commission. From the little research I've done from the five major county jails within the State of Illinois, Cook County Jail is the only jail that has been allowing detainees access to the electoral process. Researching online county jail rules and regulations, they pretty much model I believe an agency that prepares these rules for them because the format on the web page is identical, except for a couple. And information within the web site are different based on address of the jail, population of the jail, and services of the jail.

But from my limited research, all the jails have no rules regarding a detainee's right to vote, their ability to register to vote; and research in Illinois voter laws, the statutory code doesn't even state an individual detained has the right to vote or right to register to vote.



_ .

So becoming aware of this information as an organizer in mind, I also work with individuals that during the presidential election process, we hit the neighborhoods registering people to vote. One of the individuals that I focused on, a group that I focused on, the ones who are returning citizens that do come home, to remind them they do have the right to vote.

Illinois Department of Corrections has a policy within the re-entry process, what they call that is the -- I forgot what it's called, but it's a program where incarcerated individuals who go through the process at least 90 days before they're released, and most institutions do inform them of their right to vote.

The maximum security prison, such as Stateville, an individual who just entered into our re-entry home just arrived after serving in Stateville 33 years in prison didn't realize he had the right to vote because he -- they didn't tell him that. They don't have a lot of the services at the maximum security prisons that the minimum and medium prisons has in regards to pre-release preparation and informing them of their statutory



right to vote.

So since my release, I did participate in the electoral process this year for the first time. So that was wonderful for me. I felt really, really great. I didn't have time to do the research on the individuals running because I do a lot of work with IMAN. I'm constantly busy. I'm working close to 15, 16, 17 hours a day, literally practically seven days a week because there's so much work to be done in our communities to bring them back to the forefront especially when you're returning citizens.

So some of the solutions that I was thinking of, an actual solution was from Michelle regarding -- and also my sister right here -- going to the jails. We do have enough volunteers. I believe that we can participate with your organization to help you out with that. So we do have people that would love to participate with that.

And I would like to continue further research regarding various county jails now that I'm working with the returning citizen population in the State of Illinois, and we're working on



surveys from the bill we just had signed into law 1 2 dealing with parole reform. So on the surveys, I will ask, do you know you have the right to vote, 3 just so we can start collecting that data. And I 4 can start using that information around organizing 5 so that we get out in the streets and start helping 6 7 these individuals register. 8 CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you for that, 9 Mr. Blackwell. We appreciate it. Mr. Chamberlain,

you have the floor.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I won't need 12 minutes either. Good morning. Mv name is Marlon Chamberlain and I'm organizer with the Community Renewal Society. And the particular group of people that I work with are formerly incarcerated and we have a group called the FORCE Project which is an acronym for Fighting to Overcome Records & Create Equality, and it's actually led by people with records to address policy that directly affects us.

I also served ten years in federal prison. I was originally sentenced to a 20-year federal prison sentence for a nonviolent conviction, and in 2007 when the non -- when the Fair Citizen Act



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

passed, my sentence was reduced from 20 to 14 years in which I served 10.

A lot of the work that we do I think we've heard already this morning, but I think our focal point, and like I said, we've heard this over and over, is just the educational piece. Because when I was released from prison, my PO told me that I couldn't vote, and along with like pretty much the 90 percent of the halfway house that I was sent home to was under the impression that we couldn't vote.

And so part of our work now has really been just getting out in the streets and really educating people about their rights to vote. So we have these workshops that we do call Know Your Rights, Exercise Your Rights, in which we explain to people that they can vote, and then we also explain that the process doesn't end just when you vote, that people can get involved and that it's important for you to know who your alderman is and what his responsibility is, who is your State Senator, your representative -- your House Representative and what their responsibilities are.

We also teach classes about how a bill is



created and passed through the legislature. And then we also organize people with records and take them to Springfield to address a lot of the policy that's in place that hinders us from actually making a transition back into society.

So a lot of our work is educational, getting out in the streets and really just talking to people. And a lot of things that I've heard this morning, when we did our voter registration drive, we had set our original goal of registering 2,000 people with records. We didn't hit that goal, but we did hit a thousand people that registered to vote that had records, and some of the obstacles that we faced were the Social Security Numbers and the address as far as like having a permanent address.

But what I've learned overall in the process was the fact that people just didn't know. And because -- like I said, my PO told me that I couldn't vote. So it's just a lack of people being able to like really understand that they can vote and then also understanding why it's important for us, especially people with records, to be involved in the process because a lot of times when laws and



things are created, when you look at the table, at the people sitting in the room making decisions, you don't see people with records. And so it's almost like you have a group of people speaking on behalf of people who really don't understand what our obstacles and issues are.

And that's really what we like really stand in value and believe in as far as having people with records at the table when decisions are made and then also educating people about what their rights are. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much. And Mr. Chamberlain, just a point of clarification. You mentioned PO. I assume that means parole officer?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: With that, we have 25 about minutes on this panel for questions and answers.

I'll repeat the rules. So everyone on the Committee is entitled to one question and one follow-up, but we can amend those rules if we have time remaining at the end.

Mr. Nevels had a question.

MR. NEVELS: Yes. This question is for



Michelle. You mentioned that of the top three barriers of young people you were working with, and I guess it was Cook County Jail, one of those was access to the last four digits of their Social Security Number. Maybe I don't understand, you know, the way that the Sheriff's Department or Cook County Jail operates, but it would seem to me that the incarcerating entity would have access to that information.

MS. MBEKEANI-WILEY: No, that's not the case. They do not. Just this past weekend, we had a few people and the correctional officer, even though he could verify your address and so forth, that was not available. I think that also goes with our standard arrests reports for Chicago Police Department. Some departments vary. They no longer input the last four digits of your Social Security Number on that fingerprint card. So that's not in your court case. That's not in your docket.

But for the correctional officers, from what I have seen them entering, looking to see if this is the right name, this is the right address if it's put in there, the Social Security Number is not one, not the information that they have on



there.

But to speak to that, one of the things that I always thought would be a good idea is, you know, every person that is, you know, arrested has a fingerprint, an IR number. And I think the IR number is actually more reliable than your Social Security Number because you can't really change your fingerprint. So you have people that have various aliases, but that IR number is always the same. And I have seen that through the expungement and sealing process that you put that name in, but once you have that fingerprint number, that's your identifier not just for the police department but also entered into LEADS, the Sheriff's Department as well as the FBI.

So it may be problematic and some unintended consequences if we start giving that as an option, but there has to be an alternative for people that don't have access to their Social Security Numbers or change the process of people getting their Social Security Numbers while also being sensitive to, you know, identity theft.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Wortham?

MS. WORTHAM: Perhaps Sheriff Smith can help or



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Do you know why the Social Security any of you. Number was removed from their arrest record?

I don't know why it was removed, MS. SMITH: but it's not one of the identifiers that's used to positively confirm the identity of an arrestee. Ι think at the point that someone is entering the criminal justice system, we're looking to confirm that the person is who the person is which is done through the fingerprints.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Copeland?

MR. COPELAND: Actually queuing from that, the earlier panel talked about voter ID, and it strikes me as kind of interesting, some of the folks that seem most concerned with the ability to identify eligible voters, having expanded it here.

It doesn't surprise me at all because as this would typically not be viewed as a very sympathetic population for a politician to risk his or her reputation much less re-election on, but given that -- for a person to be incarcerated, they're subject to due process of law. We're not going to incarcerate someone unless we're sure he or she is who we think they are and did the crime.

Is there an avenue for actually using the



identification process that is used in other parts of incarceration? We are essentially expanding to say we can identify this person and use that for voter registration.

MS. MBEKEANI-WILEY: Well, that's been also one of my arguments. Just to speak to the population. I do think that is a population that politicians hold themselves accountable because a lot of them are from their district. So maybe not necessarily on a national level, but aldermen, judges are held accountable to the people that are within the Cook County Jail as well as their families. It's just getting people out to vote.

But for -- one of the things that I did make an argument for is people within the Cook County Jail have like a county ID and it has a picture with their birth date, when they got in, and so forth. And so that's been one of my primary arguments is we can -- this should be -- this is considered an ID because if we don't know who they are and they're in the jail, then that's a problem, I mean, if you don't know who's in the jail; but then there's also an issue of ensuring that the name, whether it's an alias or the accurate name



and the fingerprint number, which is critical, that's online, the court case, is also the same information that's going through the booking process or the Sheriff's Department as well. CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Buys? My question is also for you. MS. BUYS: relates to something that Christina Rivers spoke about as well, and that is the issue of prison gerrymandering as it relates to the residents.

So you said that inmates who are awaiting trial can't use that as their residence, but they are counted for prison gerrymandering. Is that correct?

MS. MBEKEANI-WILEY: No, no. I'm saying it's in contrast with those detainees that have yet to be convicted, can't use it as a residence. However, people that have been convicted are using that for their residence for purposes of gerrymandering. The only distinction is conviction.

So pre-conviction, we're like, well, you're not a resident even if you've been there for eight years. But as soon as you're convicted and you go to IDOC, you are a resident.



1
2 that
3 of th
4 Pinck
5 peopl
6 in Pi
7 to co
8
9 fundi

Just to kind of expand on that. One thing that I know of, I've actually done several surveys of the state where prisons are, specifically Pinckneyville Correctional Center, there are more people incarcerated in their prison than there are in Pinckneyville, yet the representatives there get to count those bodies.

There are several grants for federal funding that use population according to the U.S. Census as determining factor or part of the equation of estimating how much funding that they get. And there has been pushback to the U.S. Census saying, hey, your reasoning for residence for people in college, they're able to decide where they want to use, the average stay in any prison is about three to five years, that's actually shorter than the actual stay for a college student, you should not be getting the body that can't even speak or vote on what they would like.

MS. BUYS: So are you aware if there are any lawsuits that have challenged this practice?

MS. MBEKEANI-WILEY: Not in the State of Illinois. I personally believe that legislation would be an ideal route. I know that



Representative LaShawn Ford has brought this to the table numerous times, and, you know, downstate has some pushback; but I do think a lot of people are not aware of the impact of having those bodies within those districts, and it's no coincidence that the representatives from those districts that have correctional backgrounds also push back as well as the lobbyists.

So there does need to be a more organized effort to support legislation and to also educate people on the impact of using those bodies for purposes of gerrymandering.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. And I have a practical question for Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Chamberlain.

In your experiences, you talked about parole officers and other I'm assuming state prison officials who have mentioned that you just can't vote, right. So I'm wondering, in your experience or the experience of people you know, has this come in the form of they're just volunteering that information and maybe it's written down on some kind of policy paper or are you asking about the right to vote and they're giving you an answer?



MR. BLACKWELL: As far as the rules are concerned, there's nothing in the rules that educate me as far as my right to vote while detained in County Jail. I believe it was just the individual just responding to my question. I'm not going to go so far as saying that they were biased or they have this complicit feelings about individuals detained within the County Jail and their right to participate in the electoral I'm going to give them the benefit of the process. doubt, but being detained in the jail for over two years, I do know that the attitudes there are very, very extreme. So I can't go so far to say, yeah, they really don't want you to vote. They feel like you lost that right because you were arrested. That's the experience I had.

With that, I don't know of any lawsuit. I believe there was a lawsuit filed in Will County in the mid '90s. I don't know how -- I know there was a lawsuit filed about no law library, and they lost on that and they had to produce a law library, but I don't know as far as allowing someone the opportunity to vote. I don't know any detainees that did vote out of Will County Jail as far as I'm



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

acquainted.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I think my PO just didn't know. My parole officer didn't know. And this wasn't -- like in the halfway house, this wasn't a conversation that like staff would have with residents. So it would be, maybe you would ask and they would tell you to go somewhere downtown to find out if you can vote. So if that person didn't take the initiative to go actually do it, then they wouldn't know.

of the FORCE Project at the time, and he was the one who really kind of guided me as to like the fact that I could vote and engage me in the process of actually getting involved.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. Other questions?
Ms. Rodriguez?

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chamberlain. So you brought up something that I just thought -- maybe this is a follow-up question for Ms. Smith. You mentioned that the Sheriff is committed to facilitating absentee voting. Is there any training of parole officers or systems in place where you educate parole officers in terms of what



the rights are for parolees?

MS. SMITH: The parole is the state. It's a supervision program from the state Department of Corrections.

In terms of the programs that we work at in the jail to advance registration and absentee voting, we rely on our superintendents or higher level supervisors, and then they select their officers that are going to work on the different projects. So we try to keep those that are going to be involved very educated on what the rights and responsibilities are.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Other questions?

MR. BLACKWELL: I would like to respond to that. I'm still on parole. I had four parol agents in the last two years and not one of them informed me of my rights. I already knew I had the right to vote. My very first parole agent, the only thing he really wanted to stress to me was to remind me that I'm still incarcerated. Even though I'm free and a citizen of the State of Illinois, technically, I'm still incarcerated. So he wanted to stress that information to me so I could get that clearly understood, and then reinforcing to me



the conditions of my parole.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But he never explained to me my right to vote.

MS. MBEKEANI-WILEY: I do think that is something that can be addressed. I know, for instance, the Shriver Center has done probationary officer and parole officer training for ensuring that people have access to health care whether it be Medicaid. Affordable Care Act. and that has been done through extensive training of those officers. I think something similar to that could be done for ensuring that people know their right to vote. And the Office of Probation and Parole have typically been fairly open to receiving those trainings. Usually it's an organization offering it for free, but receiving those trainings to let them know, hey, this is what you're supposed to be informing the clients that you're serving.

MR. COBB: Thank you. Thank you all for being here. So I'm a little disturbed. So I have a question. Hopefully you all can address and I'm thinking Michelle and Cara.

So coming from the vantage point that voting is a fundamental right and that these



persons who are in pre-trial detention still have that right, there's no conviction, it's not been stripped, and I'm hearing you say that the recent article in Slate Magazine said that only two jails in the country, at least that were listed, had a voting program.

I'm curious and I'm wondering if you could help me understand why there aren't more counties participating in these kind of programs, more initiatives like your office at the Cook County Sheriff, you know, who are creating these kinds of programs to make sure that we are protecting the fundamental rights of these persons throughout the nation as opposed to just two counties in the nation.

MS. MBEKEANI-WILEY: I think there are varying reasons. So I'll go to like the top three. Money is one. So I know like David Orr's office mails out about 7500 packets that have a voter registration form as well as an absentee ballot application to essentially the entire population of -- I mean, it takes a lot of coordination, and I think that is something that every county should be doing, but you also have to be cognizant of the



political landscape and the racial landscape.

I don't see Will County doing that, especially if their population is predominantly black. It comes also down to race and who do we value as a voter and who do we want to vote in the first place.

The other thing is that misinformation.

lot of people don't realize that you retain the right to vote while awaiting trial. I had to double check the statute because I wanted to make sure. I mean, I didn't find out until four years ago, and I looked very close, well, if you're serving a sentence, it says — this actually is a bit confusing. It says, you're detained and serving a sentence. So you're detained in jail, but you're not serving a sentence.

So I think people tend to overlook that or get a bit confused. And I had to make a few phone calls just to verify, do people retain the right to vote following trial. So I think there's also that education piece. But I also really think it's the coordination and effort because it does take effort, and if you do not have leadership that believes that that effort is valuable and



worthwhile, it's not going to happen on its own.

Just mere access into the jail to have volunteers
is something that the leadership at the Cook County

Department of Corrections had to approve because he
thinks it's important.

Good luck going into Will County. I contacted other counties. It's not happening. You barely even get certain programs, educational programs within those facilities.

So really it comes down to leadership of the Sheriff's Department, and if they sincerely believe that these people have the right to vote, they need to make an affirmative effort to ensure that they're voting. But if you don't have that leadership, you're going to run into a lot of brick walls.

And I think those are like the key things, if you believe that it's worth an investment because if you do the math, say, 7500 packets, the packets are really thick, maybe a dollar or two for mailing it. I mean, you're spending about \$15,000 for a population that in Cook County we do value but in other counties, they're like, we're not paying thousands of dollars to ensure that people



have the right to vote, and that's just the reality of certain counties, especially black and brown people, to be completely candid.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Kazmi.

MR. KAZMI: Ms. Smith, do you guys either, one, contract with organizations like the Shriver Center or IMAN to provide that service or do you guys have a team within the Sheriff's office that handles that kind of stuff?

MS. SMITH: We have a contract, but we are committed to it and work very, you know, openly with anyone who wants to come in and help us advance this. And I think -- you know, it just occurred to me. I didn't think of this in connection with coming here today, but I think everyone has had the experience of going to get your driver's license renewed and being offered the opportunity to vote in connection with that process.

I was on the litigation team when Illinois was the only state in the nation that didn't enact that law. And so if you work in the Sheriff's office or any of the organizations that are represented on this panel, we often have to look



1	for the silver lining in what we do, and I think
2	that the leadership, as evidenced by my colleagues
3	here and by the Sheriff and being committed to
4	this, you know, we can be a leader and really be
5	setting examples, and we can push to amend the
6	county jail standards, for instance, and make it
7	make that education piece something that can be put
8	forth to, you know, be something that all jails
9	have to educate on. That's an easy fix. But it's
10	a process.
11	So I think that we have a lot of good to
12	report from Cook County and maybe can push other
13	counties to follow suit.
14	CHAIRMAN LINARES: Other questions? Going
15	once. No other questions. We do have a few
16	minutes left. Does anyone want to close out with a
17	concluding statement? Thank you so much for your
18	time, Ms. Mbekeani-Wiley, Ms. Smith, Mr. Blackwell,
19	Mr. Chamberlain. We appreciate your time here.
20	With that, the session is closed. We'll
21	reconvene at 11:15 a.m.
22	(Off the record at 10:52 a.m.)
23	(On the record at 11:18 a.m.)
24	CHAIRMAN LINARES: So welcome back, everyone,



and thank you for being here today. We have our next panel up today, but before we get into that, I do want to do a public service announcement that if you're in the audience today and tweeting, the Twitter handle is usccrgov, no dot. That's the Twitter handle, and there are folks who have already been tweeting, so if you want to retweet those, that would be encouraged.

There's also I'm told a Facebook page coming up in a few weeks for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. So we'll be able to have more social media presence here.

So that, I want to go over the rules one more time because I know some of the panelists haven't been here for the whole day. But what we'll do here is everyone will give a statement of 12 minutes, maximum time. I'll be keeping time. With your time, we hope that you will not say any degrading statements to any person or organization, but we do want to hear from you. If there are, of course, as Chair, I will make a statement redirecting the conversation back on topic or we have authorized other members to speak up as well.

And then after all four of you go with



your testimonies, 12 minutes max, then we will have a question and answer session for the rest of the time. If there's any time allotted, each member here on the Committee gets one question plus a follow-up. If there's time at the end, then we'll allow for other questions as well to be asked.

So with that, thank you so much for being here. This is our language access panel here today. I'm going to introduce each one of you first. We have Ryan Cortazar. I hope I pronounced that right, with the Chicago Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. We have Veronica Cortez with MALDEF, the Mexican-American Legal Defense Education Fund. We have Shobhana Verma, I hope I said that right, with the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners. And we have Andy Kang, hello, with the Asian-Americans Advancing Justice.

Thank you again for being here. We look forward to hearing from you and to the question and answer session. And with that, we're just going to proceed starting with your right. Ryan Cortazar, the floor is yours. You have 12 minutes.

MR. CORTAZAR: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I am from the Chicago Lawyers



Committee for Civil Rights. We are a civil rights nonprofit that's been operating in Chicago since 1969. We provide services, education, fair housing, settlement assistance for prisoners, and we also work with community groups to help them get started and to navigate through the transactional law process.

The Voting Rights Project for the Chicago
Lawyers Committee was established to prevent,
reduce, and eliminate barriers to voting for
communities of color and low-income residents, and
we advocate for expanded access. As my colleague,
Ami Gandhi, spoke earlier, we operate the
866-OUR-VOTE election protection hot line. We also
support the language hot lines at 888-VE-Y-VOTA and
888-API-VOTE which provides services to Asian
language voters.

We also partner with nonprofits and with law firms in our election protection and we have hundreds of volunteers that help us and we speak with thousands of voters on election day.

But beyond that, because Illinois has elections every year, the Chicago Lawyers Committee works year round with local election authorities to



make sure that voters who run our elections comply with federal and state voting laws. These often involve open communications with election officials to address voters' concerns on election day and year round. We meet with them to assess their materials, help them recruit poll workers, which is particularly important for bilingual elections, and we also help them to expand and provide those services every year.

Every American has the right to cast an informed ballot regardless of the language they are most comfortable speaking and reading. Congress first planted the seed of this in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but it didn't really blossom until a subsequent amendment in the 1970s as Congress recognized the growing need for these language access services in order to prevent discrimination that goes beyond just language but also has to do with national origin. It intersects with your educational level and also with race in many instances.

Although the administrative determinations that determine which jurisdictions have to have language access are being revised every five or --



five years, the actual statutory provisions have not been updated -- since the 1970s even though the language and minority communities have evolved over the last 40 years, not just geographically, but also in terms of the different languages that these communities speak and their concentrations.

Any expansion of language access rights in the future must take into account how voting barriers have been constructed in the past, what the current provisions of the Voting Rights Act are, and how local governments implement -- more fail to implement their bilingual election requirements. We must also take into account the growing diversity and the current facts on the ground that have developed over those years.

First, I want to talk a little bit about the history of voting discrimination and language access. On the slide, you'll see some quotes that are from the Katzenbach versus Morgan case that spoke to discrimination against Puerto Rican voters in New York. So kind of the history of voting discrimination helped shine light on the essential nature of this problem and the steps that we need to take in the future to help eliminate it.



when Congress banned literacy tests in 1 jurisdictions that had historically disenfranchised 2 black voters through the Voting Rights Act of 1969, 3 4 it also banned discrimination against Puerto Rican voters in New York. Section 4(e) of the Act states 5 disenfranchising voters based on English literacy 6 test if the voter had completed 6th grade in a 7 8 school in the United States or its territories. This was actually a very targeted and direct attack 9 on New York's history of discrimination, and it's 10 11 apparent from the language in the statute itself which says if you completed this level of education 12 in a U.S. school or in the territory, it also says 13 specifically Puerto Rico is the covered 14

This was challenged by New York and the Supreme Court declared the provision constitutional and noted that prejudice against European and southern immigrants had played a "prominent role in the enactment of New York state literacy test."

And you can see in the first quote on the slide is a quote from the actual sponsor of the measure and it says, "The more precious than even the forms of government are the mental quality of our race." It



15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

jurisdiction.

goes on to single out Southern and European races in particular as not being a part of the heritage and the fabric of New York at that time.

But, obviously, by the time the 1960s rolled around, that wave of immigration had ended, but there was a new wave of really migration of American citizens from Puerto Rico who moved to New York during that period. And from this tiny but important intervention, recognition of this type of discrimination grew and Congress revised the Act in the 1970s.

Although some courts and election authorities did actually read this narrow provision expansively to provide bilingual voting resources, Congress recognized that a legislative fix was really needed to broaden the two narrow provisions that we talked about, in particular, the growing Chicano movement and civil rights litigation brought an action to voting discrimination against Mexican-Americans in Texas and California, and those discriminations actually fell outside the Voting Rights Act protection.

To better protect the voting rights of language minority nationwide, Congress adopted a



nationwide ban on literacy tests and passed several provisions that aimed at assisting language minorities at the polls. These are Sections 203 and 208.

So this is the text of Section 203 that pertains to this. I'll give you a little bit of a background on this. A jurisdiction is covered under 203 when either 5 percent of the voting age population of the jurisdiction are members of a single language minority and limited English proficient or when more than 10,000 citizens in this political subdivision are members of a single language minority and limited English proficient.

Additionally, the illiteracy rate of the citizens in that language minority group must be higher than the national illiteracy rate. Once the federal government determines what jurisdiction meets this requirement, that jurisdiction must provide written and oral assistance. There are currently 263 covered jurisdictions. That's a small percentage of total jurisdictions, but it's a huge percentage of actual voters which is about 31.3 percent are in these jurisdictions.

It's a practical provision. It doesn't



cover everyone. Because of that, there's also Section 208 which allows any voter to bring a person of their choice as long as it's not a representative of their employer or of their union into the polling place to actually help them translate the ballot if there's no language access there.

Implementation of that is actually a really collaborative process. What happens is the Census Bureau does a community survey which is -- doesn't actually cover everyone. It's just a survey. It's not the decennial census which counts each and every individual person in the United States. And from that, they do some regressions which look at -- as correcting any errors that the random survey has. And when they do that, they ask if people -- they ask how they speak English and their poor levels. If you say you speak English very well and you're not limit English proficient but any other level is limited English proficient.

One problem that we have with that is that we think that it's actually underinclusive and that this survey, it's less likely that people who have language -- who speak a minority language are going



to respond to government surveys.

Having said that, the census has improved its processes, but they're still obviously not perfect as we'll see from later discussions about what has happened in Illinois on this.

Once they make those designations, they take those and they send them to -- they make that public, and then those covered jurisdictions have to provide language access in terms of written materials but also in terms of oral assistance at the polls. And so what this means on the ground is that there has to be a really constant collaboration between voters, between civic groups, and between the election authorities.

In providing the written materials, one of the problems that people come across is that there's very technical language that these materials have. If anybody read the most recent amendment to the Illinois Constitution, it was extremely technical language. Very difficult for people in English to understand it. So you can imagine the difficulties that it presents for context specific minority language translations.

And so civic groups can help provide --



provide information to authorities to help them find a reputable translator because, to be honest, sometimes you'll see jurisdictions using online translation services that are not perfect. Also recruiting election judges is always difficult. It's a thousand member -- more than a thousand member temporary work force, and getting people to speak minority languages is even more difficult for those purposes.

So that kind of explains how the civic groups can help in terms of implementation.

I also want to talk about recent developments. Because of the periodic nature of elections, these officials must constantly engage other -- each other to help make sure that the advances that we make aren't lost after the election is actually processed. And because minority -- because everyone is mobile, but, in particular, immigrant communities are mobile, these -- what we have is a constant shift in these populations across the metropolitan area, not just in the city, but also in the suburbs. And so even though we might have a county be covered, from election to election, those populations might shift



from one precinct to another. And so what happens is you constantly have to have an adjustment to this.

And so the types of problems that we see too often, and it's still isolated, is sometimes we have in these jurisdictions polling place election judges or poll workers who have been in these communities longer than the language minority communities, and sometimes you have racial aspects that pop up, xenophobic comments. We've had in past elections poll workers ask where voters are from. We've had them explain to other voters that the voting lines are moving slow because these immigrant communities who are citizens who are allowed to vote haven't really been moving as quickly as possible. Sometimes they say they're slow or, you know, speaking in derogatory terms.

So in order for us to move forward, it's important that we engage the Census Bureau. We would like more public comment on how they make their determinations after their release so that we can show them what we think on the ground has happened.

So, for example, if you look up --



DuPage County was covered in 2011, but in 2016 it was not. We believe that that's probably a sampling error, and having the opportunity for public comment would be really important. We would also like to expand beyond the federal voting rights to update, to provide more expansive coverage in the future.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, Mr. Cortazar.

There will be an opportunity during question and answer if there are any topics that you didn't cover that you would like to speak up as well.

Ms. Cortez, you have the floor. Twelve minutes, please.

MS. CORTEZ: Thank you, and thank you for the opportunity to testify today. So I am the staff attorney at the Mexican-American Legal Defense Educational Fund or MALDEF. MALDEF was founded in 1968. It's a national nonprofit legal organization that employs litigation, post policy advocacy, and community education programs to protect and promote the civil rights of Latinos in the United States. For MALDEF, equal access to the ballot is a very important issue, and that's one of the reasons I'm here today.



So I want to start by saying -- and I
think Ryan touched on this a little bit -- that
things have actually improved drastically over the
years. And I was speaking to someone right before
the start, and she said the same. Things have

So language access in the State of Illinois is still -- it's a balance between the interest of the voters and the people that are going to be voting in that jurisdiction and the budgetary interests sometimes of the election

improved considerably, but there's still room for

In Illinois, we're looking at 435,000 limited English proficient voters. Many of those voters are concentrated in Cook County and Lake and Kane County, and then a smaller but still substantial number of those voters are in Will and DuPage counties.

As previously stated, in Illinois, we have -- Cook, Kane, and Lake counties are all under Section 203. So that's where they are required to provide language assistance in both material -- well, three things, materials, ballots, so ballots,



improvement.

authorities.

and then signs that they post on the walls or around the polling place, and bilingual election judges. Cook, Kane, and Lake all require Spanish. Cook has a couple of other languages that are also required in the City of Chicago, and I'll let my co-panelist talk about that a little bit.

So these three counties fall under
Section 203 because they have more than 10,000
limited English proficient voters. Like Ryan said,
DuPage fell off of Section 203 or their requirement
under Section 203 because they are now 220 people
short for that. So it's a very small number. They
still have close to 9800 people that require
language access.

And like Ryan mentioned a little bit, the survey is not super reliable. People don't necessarily answer the survey. So there's probably very much an undercount in DuPage County. So they very much may be within the 10,000 person limited English proficient person threshold. They're just not being counted.

And we -- so we are actually very glad to see that. We met with -- Ryan and I and some other political committee staff met with DuPage County



recently, and they said that even though they have fallen out of the 203 requirements, they're still going to continue to provide language access. So that's something that's very important to us. We're very glad to see something like that, that these counties are taking that initiative and taking that stand instead of just saying, oh, we're not required anymore even though we actually already have a lot of materials translated, we're still just not going to do it. Instead, they're taking the initiative and saying they are going to do it.

Now Will County also does not fall under Section 203, and they have 9600 limited English proficient voters in Spanish. And so at this point, they haven't said anything about whether or not they're willing to start thinking about providing language assistance no matter -- not mattering that they're no longer under section -- or they're still not under Section 203.

Something else that Ryan mentioned is under Section 208, you are allowed to bring someone to the polling place with you to vote. Sometimes that rule is just -- people don't know that it



exists. People don't know that they can come into a polling place with someone to help them vote, and sometimes polling places make it a little more intimidating to do that when you show up to a polling place and you say, this person is going to help me vote, and they say, well, you need to sign something, you need to sign this, this form has to be filled out, and it creates kind of this more tense situation than it necessarily needs to be considering that all they're trying to do is vote.

I feel like I'm a little bit repetitive, and I'm trying not to be. As Ryan said earlier, there are stories about how limited English proficient voters are being mistreated. Some of that really is people saying things like, can you hurry up, you're voting very slowly, or just not providing the services.

I have done poll watching now for a few -five or six years, and you go to the polling places
and the bilingual materials might still be in the
envelope in the locker. They have them. They are
required to post them up. They have the bilingual
ballots or ballots in other languages. They have
everything that they need in the polling place.



They're just not necessarily pulling them out and posting them. Whether that's because of lack of training or because the person just chooses not to and knows that they're there, I don't know. It's not always clear.

when there is a poll watcher there, they approach the election judges and say, hey, you're under Section 203, you should have bilingual materials, do you have them? Can you put them up? Usually people then don't say anything, but the fact that they weren't up there to begin with is a little disheartening for the people that have -- at that point have voted already.

And then the second thing is, and this —
there's not always bilingual polling judges even if
it's a requirement. Again doing some poll
watching, Chicago does actually — Chicago and Cook
County do a really good job of it. Every once in a
while, there's a miss. But as we move out further
to the counties that have a smaller limited English
proficient community but still enough to qualify
for Section 203, there are less. Maybe what it is
is less recruitment efforts or not just enough
people applying for these positions so that they



can put them specifically where they need to be.

So we're working with those -- well, some of those counties are willing to work with me to try to recruit more people, but not having a bilingual election judge at the polling place makes it very intimidating, even though the materials might be there for the person to kind of check in. When you're checking in, what's your name, what's your address, whatever it is to get you to your ballot. It's a little more intimidating to do that in English if you're not very English proficient.

Sometimes also the polling judge or the bilingual election judge might be in the polling place but isn't necessarily at the front of the polling place. They might be over doing one of the other tasks that the polling judges do. That's a very long day and lots of things to do. So they end up in a different part of the polling place. And so the check-in or where people are coming into the line, they don't know that there is a bilingual -- or that there is language access there in terms of a person. That's something that I have seen kind of repeatedly over the course of my experience.



So something that I think is important to note is that we are -- there have been studies of people saying, okay, so if you currently have language access, if you did not have language access, are you still likely to vote? And 70 percent of limited English proficient people have said they would not vote if they didn't have language access.

That's important to know because they are U.S. citizens. They are entitled to that vote. And they shouldn't have any -- as much as possible, they should not have anything blocking it.

So something that we hear a lot of times from election authorities or from arguments against language access is it's too expensive. So people have looked into that. There's some research that's been done, and it's not. A bilingual poll worker is a poll worker. They're not taking someone else's position. If you have five poll workers, you have five poll workers. You just have one of them now can also serve the limited English proficient community in the area or in the polling place as well, in the precinct. That's not an added cost.



For the translation of materials, community groups volunteer to do that very often because they rather -- they want to have their community served and properly. So community groups are willing to look at translations when they're -- if someone else has done them and they just want to have someone else to look at them or to do the translations.

I know we've worked with groups that definitely say that they volunteer and they're willing to look at them, they're willing to do them for -- and they do them for free. So that's not an added cost.

The real maybe added cost would be the printing, and that's been arguably not very much. Actually some election authorities have said it's not an extra cost at all.

And so the last thing I think I will say before I'm cut off is another argument that people say -- that have against language access in the voting arena is, well, people are U.S. citizens, they should speak English. Or if you became a U.S. citizen, they passed the test in English, they speak English. And the test that you take for



naturalization isn't an English test. It's a test 1 2 in civics and government, and there are questions that you can memorize and that you can take. And 3 being able to answer these -- what is it? A 4 5 hundred questions -- any one of those hundred questions doesn't mean that you are completely 6 fluent in English and doesn't mean that you can 7 8 understand really complicated things like 9 amendments that were presented in the last ballot 10 or referenda that come up. I know sometimes I have 11 a very hard time reading these and I'm fluent in English. 12

So you can understand that someone that is not completely fluent in English would have trouble understanding some of these and getting some of this information.

So being a U.S. citizen or taking the naturalization test doesn't guarantee that that person is proficient or completely fluent in English. So they still need a little help and they still have the right to vote because they did pass the test and they are U.S. citizens.

I'll end with that.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much for that



13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

testimony. Ms. Verma, you have 12 minutes and the floor is yours.

MS. VERMA: Hello, everyone. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be here. I want to thank the whole Commission.

I'm honored to be here today to represent the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners and share about the Board's commitment to administer a transparent, impartial, and accurate election system. The Chicago Board of Elections oversees one of the largest election operations in the United States with approximately 1.6 million registered voters and 2,069 precincts. Out of these over 1.6 million registered voters, we have people from various ethnicities for whom English is a second language and may require ballots and other voting materials in their native language. Today, I would like to share about how we make that possible. I have a PowerPoint that I wanted to --

CHAIRMAN LINARES: I'm going to ask, folks in the back, can you hear? No. If you don't mind speaking up a little louder.

MS. VERMA: Thank you for that reminder.

MS. BUYS: While we're waiting, could you



repeat the figures you gave? 1.6 million registered voters and how many with limited English proficiency?

MS. VERMA: We don't have any strict numbers for limited English proficiency because, again, it's based on the census data and we depend on the 5 percent of the 10,000 members that are reflected in the census report which is what we follow. But we do have -- obviously for three different languages, we've already qualified for language assistance. So Chicago Board of Elections has been providing language assistance in Spanish since the I consider this organization a pioneer source because we were ahead of the times; in Chinese since early 2000s; and Hindi, that was added after the 2010 census report. And we also provide -- I'll get into that later, but we also provide some language assistance in Polish. get into that when I get to my presentation.

So the executive director,

Mr. Lance Gough, is here and I wanted to share
something that I really enjoy when he shared it
with us. Mayor Harold Washington told the
Executive Director, Take care of the communities



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and the communities will take care of you. And that is what our organization believes in.

Under Section 203 of the federal Voting
Rights Act, the 2010 United States Census resulted
in the Census Bureau indicating that Chicago, LA,
and New York needed to begin offering language
assistance at the polls to the U.S. citizens from
India who have limited English proficiency. The
Asian Indian community is very diverse and to bring
the policy requiring minority language coverage to
life.

In 2011, the Chicago Election Board consulted with a variety of foundation community groups and its many partners in the local media. The determination was made that Election Board should move forward with balloting signage and other voting materials in Hindi. I wanted to emphasize because the languages are diverse. We speak multiple languages in India, that was a big concentration and a decision to be made.

when I came on board in 2014, I was given the responsibility to lead the Asian Indian language access and outreach program with the confidence that I understand the challenges facing



minority language communities that I will be able to reach out and serve a very diverse Asian Indian population with language assistance in the voting process. I would like to add here that prior to the Hindi language, language assistance was already required and being provided in Spanish and Chinese. So when we speak of language assistance,

having a language assistance program in place does not automatically benefit the community. requires extensive voter outreach, education, and communication with voters. Successful language assistance begins with the community liaison knowing all the facets of operation, having a thorough understanding of our community services division which recruits and trains poll workers and deputy voter registrars, knowing the ins and outs of voter registration, responsibilities of poll workers, their training, and how the election equipment functions, and other election services. These are some of the things that we really have to focus on while we work with community members.

when assisting minority language citizens, our focus is on providing valuable election material as required by Section 203 by which we



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

mean translating every possible voter contact material, every voter form, all polling place signs and materials including the smallest of stickers on voting equipment, all banners for outreach events or election functions like early voting by mail and election day voting, all news releases, all legal notices that are published in local newspapers. We recruit and retrain valuable poll workers to provide oral assistance to voters in select precincts around the City of Chicago. Every polling place also has test screen voting equipment with ballots in English, Hindi, Spanish, and Chinese. These ballots are actually also available as audio, available for all of these ballots in all of these languages as well on the test screen.

On election day, language assistance is also available via phone through election central located here in downtown. We have people speaking multiple languages over the phone.

And I just want to note that when Veronica was mentioning about election signs, I just wanted to make a quick mention here that all the Chicago Board of Elections signage are actually in four languages. I brought some samples here to share if



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

anybody is interested. Just to avoid any of that confusion in terms of whether ballot material or multi-language material is available or not, all our signs are actually prepared in four languages. So we kind of, thankfully, foresee that as a problem in the future. So we have all of that in four languages. If there's a sign in one language, it's actually in all four so everything is there.

So by translation, we believe in not making voters search in English to find a translated page. That helps avoid confusion and misdirection by having every language user navigate our Web site fully. When you look at our Web site, we think of a road map. Imagine being in a foreign land without knowing their language. Imagine someone just handed us a map in a language we don't read or understand. Even with a map in hand, would one really be able to find their way around?

So that is the philosophy that is behind our Web site. And here is a sample that I would like to share. On the one side, on the left we see — that's our home page of the Web site in Hindi and on the right side we see English. So what we do is we don't make Spanish, Chinese, Hindi or



Polish-speaking web users search in English words and characters and then find a translation. The picture on the left, as I just mentioned, is our home page in Hindi and the other one is in English. If someone who doesn't know Hindi wouldn't be able to navigate the Hindi page, but we don't expect a person to read Hindi to navigate the web page in English.

On our home page, we can select the language from there and navigate all the voter-based systems, how to register, early voting, and voting by mail, finding their polling place, sample ballots or any of the information that's available for any voter.

On translations, again that's -- that's a problem that we all have heard about and we try to address that. We use authentic translations prepared by inhouse staff that understands the subtleties of election law and the culture meanings of words commonly used in election and voting. We try to avoid any paths toward confusion and that can be caused by bad translations.

As a rule, we avoid short cuts. We don't use Google Translation. That would be the biggest



mistake if I ever said that. As a rule, we avoid short cuts. We don't use Google Translation. We don't want to risk primary appearing in grade schools or early voting to come off as early voting. So this is quality of translation matters.

And I've been to some other events where we've had discussions about addressing language in minority communities, and one thing that I -- without even being asked for, I offer my advice, please don't go to Google Translations. That's something that we strongly believe in at the Board and follow.

In the absence of a person or a staff who can translate or oversee the translations with the help of Election Assistance Commission, if that is not available, we use a translation service and have community partners to view the work as I mentioned. We work very closely with the community organizations and they have been very helpful along the process.

We partner with community groups. I'm glad that we have some of them right here with us. And this is a picture from one of those meetings that I wanted to add here. So we do partner with



1 | community groups and I'm glad to be here.

Partnerships are continuous. We don't just meet during election time. We attend events all year around. We meet, we strategize for better outreach methods on a regular basis. We work with community groups in formulating policy which results in having election reforms.

Here are some of our images that I wanted to share. When we talk about working with language within a minority community or a minority language speaking community, outreach for us is a year-round activity. So here are some of the examples where we reached out to the community. It can be very challenging, but the Board works with the community by engaging with several across -- interactions by age, class, gender, any other diversity, representations of diversity voters.

Over the past four years, our voter education and our engagement work, we have developed an understanding of the complexity of communities' participation in the electoral process which includes cultural and language barriers that we've been discussing.

So these are some of the events where we



have been participating. We go where people are.

Like I said, we attend various community events and religious events working with faith-based organizations, high schools, colleges. We believe in engaging voters, listening to them, and registering them where they are so that we can also get an opportunity to share about the language assistance program and recruiting poll workers in the community.

Some more opportunities. We've had and take pride in in working with the community groups, awarding some of our partners. This one in the middle I would like to highlight. Our chairwoman, Ms. Hernandez, who is also fluently bilingual. She speaks Spanish. So that's a plus for us because after every press conference after she's already briefed them in English, she also presents it in Spanish. So that's something also.

Outreach when it comes to what is required in Section 203. We also do a few things above and beyond. As I mentioned, I was going to touch upon Polish. We also have sample ballots in Korean because we've learned that there are some precincts where we have populations speaking and reading the



Korean language. So we have sample ballots in Korean. We also have comprehensive assistance for our large Polish-American population. This includes Polish version of our Web site, invaluable poll workers, and working with the Polish media.

There was something about the community case study that we did before. I can share about it later if questions come up. I do have the information. Basically, this was a community forum where we got in touch with all the community members about all the feedback. Some of the reforms have already been made and been considered. There's on-line voter registration, election day registration, voter education. So these are some of the feedback we received, and we've been working with the media organizations. And on-line voter registration is actually picking up pretty well and also available in four languages, and we were very closely involved in that, to bring that into practice.

would just like to say that we have one community made of many populations. As election administrators, we have to reach out and include



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 the many diverse populations in the election 2 process, and that can only be accomplished by language assistance and outreach. From the 3 4 feedback that I've received from communities. because we are on the front line working with 5 6 people, people have given us feedback in terms of it does make a difference when they see someone who 7 8 looks like them, speaks their language, physically 9 available at the polling place, readily available 10 to assist them. So besides having all the voting 11 material in print, it's also helpful to have people 12 who can already assist them. 13 And I will save time for some of the stuff 14 later. Thank you. 15 Thank you, Ms. Verma. CHAIRMAN LINARES: We appreciate that. 16 17 with that, Mr. Kang, you have the floor. You have 12 minutes. 18 19 MR. KANG: Thank you. My name is Andy Kang. I'm the Legal Director at Asian Americans Advancing 20 21 Justice in Chicago. We have been in existence for 25 years now. We have affiliates in San Francisco, 22 23 LA, DC, and recently Atlanta.

24

Voting rights has been something that

we've been working on for a very long time, and as Shobhana has mentioned, we're working on Section 203 language assistance by engaging the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners and the Cook County Clerk's office. We've been working on that since Chinese came on line, what, 2000.

Just to give you some context of the importance of language access to the Asian-American community. In the Chicagoland area, so Chicago, metro Chicago, and the collar counties, based on the 2010 census, there are 580,000 Asian-Americans. Now over 30 percent of that population is limited English proficient. With some groups such as the Laos, Vietnamese, Thai, as well as the Koreans and Chinese, 40 percent or more are limited English.

So now I just mentioned one group, the Chinese, obviously that are covered by Section 203. As Ryan mentioned before, some of these other groups do not qualify because they do not meet the threshold, but Section 208 is available for them. And in the instance of Korean, this was something unscripted but I think it's worth mentioning, the Chicago Board of Elections, the Cook County Clerk's office agreeing when they met with the community at



the Korean-American Committee to volunteer to provide translated ballots and also willingness to place bilingual Korean-speaking judges in a select number of places.

That was a huge thing for the community. It's not something that's required by federal law, but they saw the need and they met it. So I think those are the types of efforts that need to be applied wherever they happen.

The scope of our language access work. We have been poll monitoring for many, many years; but in 2016, in March, during the March primary, we sent out 40 poll monitors to cover 90 precincts, and in the November, we sent out 48 poll monitors to cover 124 precincts. And this is primarily Cook County, suburban Cook as well as City of Chicago.

And, you know, one of the things that I'll just mention up front is 25 of our poll monitors in the March primary covered the China Town area because there was a hotly contested primary there where we anticipated interest by Chinese-speaking voters would be particularly high because there was a Chinese-American candidate. I'll get back to that race as I go on.



11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

23

Some of the issues or lessons that we encountered and have encountered and engaged in conversations with the Board of Elections as well as the Clerk's office, making sure that election judges know, as has been mentioned, that when there is a folder of translated materials that that's not bonus materials. That's not a discretionary packet. That's something that should be put on In some polling places, this is not an display. I want to be very, very clear. Overwhelmingly not a problem.

But in a significant minority, some of the judges maybe misunderstand what's required of them or just didn't know the packet was there, and at those moments, our poll monitors help them identify where they can find the packet. Once they're found, we very rarely encounter any instances where they object to putting them on display.

But to give you a sense of the scope, in the March primary in 2016, we encountered 18 instances where the materials weren't displayed when our poll monitors came on the scene. In only I believe two instances was there any kind of resistance once they found them to put them up on

display. But by November 2016, after conversations with our counterparts on the government side, that number cut in half. So as you can see, having ongoing dialogue, identifying a problem spot, it does work out in addressing some of these issues.

I would be remiss to say that as our community and limited English immigrant community fans out to the suburbs, there are precincts and polling places where some of the long-standing election judges aren't as familiar with dealing with limited English speaking voters. So there is the education piece that is an ongoing thing that we will continue to work with them on making sure it happens.

I think a second lesson that we came away with is Illinois recently had election day registration come on line as a state. You know, in the China Town community, we crunched the numbers with the Chicago Board of Elections, and these are raw data. So I just want -- I don't want to hold them to indicate -- they have been corrected since we last spoke.

Two of the Chicago wards that were contained within this hotly contested primary



battle, the 11th ward and 25th ward, the numbers indicated that there were 1200 election day registrations. So those are new voters, people that wanted to vote for the first time. Now we don't know who those voters were, but what I can tell you is that primary race was decided by 515 votes. And so I only bring that up as a lesson that these measures in registering to vote and voting, they do make a difference, that there are a lot of folks that sometimes don't realize what's going on and do want to vote on election day. And so to the extent possible, our orientation supports anything we can do to reduce those barriers.

The final lesson that I would say is that we want to make sure that we're targeting the right precincts. So under 203, Section 203, we have a broad discretion, the election officials do, making sure that they're providing language assistance, providing the resources where they're needed the most. And the discussions we have, while we do use anecdotal data, it's largely based on census data. So it's really important for us to reiterate that, you know, making sure that people are responding to the census, but that the census is always fully



funded and doing its best to make sure that it's engaging the immigrant community because, as you can imagine, with limited English speaking individuals, responding to a census is not always going to be an easy thing. So working with the community making sure that data is right so we can have a good sense that we're targeting the right places.

I'd say the last thing that I would bring up is that I mentioned that working with election officials is really important. I had the pleasure last year of going to a meeting held by the Federal Election Assistance Commission, and Mr. Lance Gough was there to join me. And it was really a fantastic opportunity to not only compare notes with advocates from around the country that are also trying to improve language assistance for their community, but also hearing and learning from other folks from around the country that work in providing that assistance on the government side.

And I think it would be a real shame for that venue and that mechanism to no longer exist, and I understand that there might be some consideration of that. And so I would really



strongly urge that we do everything we can to protect that resource, not only for Illinois, but for limited English speaking voters around the country.

And, finally, I'm going to hammer this home. As I mentioned, election day registration, there was a high usage in at least one particular area of strong interest from the immigrant voters. We are also hoping that automatic voter registration would be something that Illinois would embrace to, again, reduce some of the barriers that limited English speaking voters may experience in trying to vote. So with our community having traditionally the lowest turnout and registration rates in Illinois, these are the things that we really hope we can see come to pass.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much, Mr. Kang. Thank you all for your testimony. We're going to enter into a question and answer period. We do have 24 minutes to do so. First question is going to Ms. Borowiec.

MS. BOHDZIEWICZ-BOROWIEC: Thank you. I have a question about sort of the mechanics between census



and voters. We'll say Chicago again. Chicago has such a wonderful outreach. I'm a Polish immigrant. We do have a really great outreach coordinator at the Board of Elections that does so much work within the community. So we're fine.

But say we're somewhere further, and there is a community that has Polish, whatever that is, say Croatian, there are no civic groups, what's -- I mean, what's the mechanism -- will this automatically come from census to whoever supervises voting for the language access materials or do we have to fight for this to have that?

MR. CORTAZAR: If there's a minority, if there's a language minority group that reaches one of those targets, then they will get that information from the census. But if they don't reach that, I don't think there is a line of communication between the census and the election authorities to say this is how many language minorities are in this group. That information might be available, but my understanding is that is not -- that's not published in the federal register to the same extent.

MS. BOHDZIEWICZ-BOROWIEC: So if there is



10,000, the election authorities will get that information?

MR. CORTAZAR: That's right, yes.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. I'm going to take Chair's priority and ask a question. It's more of a clarification. I think, Mr. Kang, you mentioned Section 208 and earlier there was Section 203. Can one of you explain what these laws are and what the difference is?

MR. KANG: Really basically, Section 203 requires the whole boat load of language assistance, right, soup to nuts, anything in English be provided in that language, right.

Section 208 is something more basic where all it's saying is that unless you're dealing with your employer or your union rep, you can bring an in a friend or a helper, it could be a volunteer you just met outside to provide you with the language assistance you need to vote, right.

And so our organization, many other organizations have two-sided fliers that we hand out or we distribute in communities so folks know that. Some time election judges, you know, they forget that rule. There's a lot of things they're



trying to do to stay on top of on election day. It sometimes feels a little unnatural to let another person into the voting booth with them.

Usually if you just jog their memory, they remember, oh, yes, that person just has to sign an affidavit that they're not going to try to influence the person's vote and then they can help them vote. That's all 208 is.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. Are these state or federal level sections?

MR. KANG: These are both federal under the Voting Rights Act.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. Other questions? Starting from the far left. Ms. Wortham.

MS. WORTHAM: This is to anybody. Can you hear me? I can't hear myself. I would like to just inform you a little bit about the orientation and attitude of the voters whom you're helping. Are these voters expecting to remain limited English speaking and see your outreach as a way of accommodating that? Or when you're talking to them, do these people have prospects of being fully English speaking as possible and see you as -- people in your organizations as facilitators for

them as they move on in their continuation of learning the language?

I really would like to see the other side of your outreach, the people you're outreaching to.

MS. CORTEZ: So some of the people that are voters that are limited English proficient are 50, 70 years old, 60 years old. Some of them might be younger. So you might have an 18-year-old that might be limited English proficient now and won't be so limited English proficient in 20 years. Some of them will learn more English and some of them won't. There's no telling. Our services or what we're doing isn't -- isn't saying that they're going to become completely fully English.

As long as the census data and/or the survey data still says they mark -- continue to mark off that they need help with accessing the ballots because of their language abilities, then they're still going -- we're hoping they're still going to continue to receive those services.

MR. KANG: So, you know, to piggyback on those comments, I think with first gen new Americans, the challenges are a little bit more pronounced, right. They may have functional English to run a business,



but, you know, I think someone's comment earlier, being an attorney and a fluent English speaker myself, some of those referendum questions, I'm not quite sure what I'm being asked sometimes.

So I think having a comfort level in your native first language, that is something that really encourages someone to engage in the voting process. I think traditionally you find with second generation or even 1.5 generation, the acclimation and having the English skills does come over time.

But I think the one thing we want to make sure is that newcomers that come, you know, newly minted U.S. citizens don't feel like they have to wait before they can vote, right. I think, you know, when Section 203 was up for renewal in Congress, there was some debate over whether this promotes folks not learning English and, you know, Congressman John Lewis actually got on the floor and said, if we don't provide Section 203 as a right for new Americans, we're basically supporting a literacy test, modern day literacy test to immigrants. That's just not something that we want to do. So those are words that I take to heart.



1 If I could have a quick moment here MS. VERMA: 2 to share a couple experiences that I've had because being in the forefront, working with voters 3 directly and reaching out to them about language 4 access, I would agree with both Veronica and Andy's 5 6 comments because there is definitely a need for 7 language assistance because you can see the difference. As I've been working with communities 8 9 and I was surprised to meet people who live in the United States for 10, 15, 20 years, been citizens. 10 but just never registered to vote. And you can see 11 12 what the barriers are and what keeps them away on 13 election day.

So those are some of the eye-opening experiences that I have had which I have lived here for ten years, but, again, having the privilege of knowing the language and all of that that we have we don't realize when we go out and work with people and we see the limitations and barriers that they have. Whatever is being done, you know, there's always room for more; but, again, whatever is being done, there's definitely no going back because it does help and it's working.

And when you see those people who have



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

lived here that long and are finally coming out and being excited to register and then voting, it's a great feeling and you can see the positive result

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Nevels?

MR. NEVELS: So in that line, in that vein of making sure that newly minted citizens exercise the franchise, you know, with the recent xenophobic rhetoric, at least at the national level, to what degree do you believe that may impact language access provision or utilization of those services specifically as it relates to -- you mentioned I believe, Ms. Verma, that there's some citizens who have been citizens for 20 years and haven't voted. Is that a concern? Are you seeing something now? Are you preparing strategically in your messaging or are you thinking about that rhetoric and how it may be potentially impacting language access?

MS. VERMA: Yes, of course, and that is the whole purpose behind this language access program and all the efforts that we put into it and all the images of us being out in the community working with people.

MR. NEVELS: That rhetoric is relatively new.



right there.

You've been doing this for a minute now, right, and now we have this rise of rhetoric taking place, at least at the national level.

MS. VERMA: I always see the positive that comes from this because I believe this is important and the fact that, you know, it's never too late. So if this -- and I know there were things that could have been done before, but like I said, we've been providing language assistance in Spanish since the '70s. We have almost 900 precincts in Chicago. and it's a very robust outreach program, you know. You see this growing and you can see the participation goes up. And, for me, for the Asian India community that I'm noticing and all the people that I work with, for me, yes. I'm happy to use this as a example. I encourage whoever we can that this is a positive step and it helps and it's working and I think it needs to continue.

MR. KANG: I was going to say, and I'll try to keep this in general terms out of respect for the Commission, there is actually stronger interest in voting in the immigrant communities, at least based on, you know, the community partners that we work with. If they weren't paying attention before,



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

they are now.

And so now that's not to say that many members of the Asian-American community didn't vote a certain way and maybe have some regrets with that decision or -- I realize that maybe they want to reconsider some of the priorities or factors that they haven't thought about. I think we're finding at least in the community that there is a renewed interest in being engaged which is a healthy thing. And so, you know, to the extent that anti-immigrant rhetoric and things that are out there, if it was meant to discourage people, actually I think it's going to have the opposite effect.

MS. CORTEZ: I would like to add just that citizenship applications are on the rise. There's been -- and so we're going to see more people becoming citizens, right. That application rate has been more than it has been. And so there's going to be more people probably that are going to need language access that are citizens but also more people that are going to want to go and register and become -- they're becoming U.S. citizens because of the rhetoric right now.

MR. CORTAZAR: I also don't want to at the same



time discount what you were saying. I think that, you know, we had reports of voter intimidation at the polls. I think we saw in the news people talking about people in the polls who were not citizens who, based on their opinion, in certain instances, those people making those comments were not actually citizens themselves. But I think that part of what that comes from is from the xenophobic rhetoric that we're having and also ignorance about the history of voting rights in the country and the ignorance about the fact that you do -- that people do have this right for 40 years now to cast an informed ballot in the language that they're most comfortable speaking and reading.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you for those comments. Ms. Rodriguez?

MS. RODRIGUEZ: I had a point of clarification on the application of Section 203 and 208 in terms of identifying languages based on -- is it the census? And I guess this question came up I think when Ms. Verma mentioned that the Korean language was -- I don't know if it was a ward or a district -- ward, in this case. So do you revisit that through the American Community Survey in terms of



identifying -- providing the language for specific area? Clarification on determining the application.

MR. KANG: I'm going to give this back to Ryan and then Shobhana, but with respect to the Koreans, it was a mix. So it's always a little bit of a mix. We looked at the ACS data and had a conversation with Chicago Board of Elections and David Orr's office, the Cook County Clerk. And then there was some community feedback from some of our Korean partners about areas that they thought were higher needs — higher need areas.

So, for example in Chicago, the highest need areas are where -- there are a couple of well-known Korean senior homes, and these are voters that are not mobile. So they usually vote by mail and a translated sample ballot becomes incredibly useful. So those were some of the little tweaks and considerations that the data doesn't always give you that picture of.

MR. CORTAZAR: I believe the question was whether they use the decennial census or the American Community Survey. So I believe that up until the mid 2000s, it was the census itself; and



then, at that point, they started using the survey.

And that has some -- actually since they have been doing that, every five years, the 2016 203 coverage is broader in general than what we saw in 2011.

But that does not mean that we don't have concerns. I think one of the good things about that is that we realize people move more than once every ten years. But the problem is that we also on this panel realize that we might have some problems with the methodology because of what happened in DuPage County where what we think is happening on the ground is that community is growing, but what the regression showed or what their survey showed was that it had gone down a little bit. We just don't think that that's actually the case.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. Other questions?
Mr. Howard?

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Kang, you had mentioned the Election Assistance Commission Termination Act, HR634. Could you give us a background on that and what your group is doing in opposition?

MR. KANG: Well, along with our affiliates, we are obviously opposed to that effort. As far as



the background behind it, I'm trying to remember my 1 2 parameters here before the Commission. I think 3 there are some folks who are not of a mind that 4 resources, federal resources or even attention 5 should be given to encouraging immigrant voters to vote, right, that those type of efforts, maybe 6 7 money may be better spent in other places, right, 8 and we would differ with that point of view. I think a more cynical view would be that 9 10 there are folks that are not keen on our community

there are folks that are not keen on our community or the limited English new Americans, that demographic voting in elections. And so there may be a lot of different reasons for that, but, you know, I couldn't speculate on that background with certainty for the Commission.

MR. HOWARD: Is that currently being debated?

Do you know what the status of that bill is?

MR. KANG: I don't know the status of that bill as of this week. I do know that that was something that was filed and it's being looked at, and my understanding is it does have support and so it's something we are concerned about.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Other questions? Going



11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

once, twice? Hearing no questions, we do have a few minutes. I'll leave it for you on the panel to -- if there's anyone with a concluding thought that you would like to share? None heard.

We want to thank you, Mr. Kang, Ms. Verma,

Ms. Cortez, and Mr. Cortazar for your testimony today. We will be compiling all the transcripts and putting forth recommendations in the next few months. With that, we appreciate it again. Thank you so much, and this session is closed.

This Committee will be taking a lunch break, and we will reconvene again at 1:30 p.m.

(Off the record at 12:24 p.m.)

(On the record at 1:32 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Well, good afternoon. Thank you for those who have shown up. We had a great morning of testimony here for those of you who were here. Thank you to the Committee, too, for all the questions that you have asked so far.

We have our new set of panelists today to talk about voting across social groups. Before we get into that, before we get into the rules, I do want to introduce Mr. Marty Castro who was formerly the commissioner -- the Chair from Washington,



D.C., of U.S. Commission of Civil Rights. You want to say a few words.

MR. KAZMI: He didn't get fired.

MR. CASTRO: My term expired. So now I'm a civilian, a veteran of this august body. I served as a member of the State Advisory Committee, Vice Chairman of the State Advisory Committee, Chair of the Advisory Committee, and then the President -- President Obama deigned to appoint me to the big Commission and made me Chair. So I served there for six years and it was a great honor.

We addressed many of the issues that affect folks here in Illinois and across the country, and we worked in tandem with this advisory committee on a number of issues including, most recently, the issue of environmental justice which is important. And I'm glad to see that you're focusing on voting rights here in Illinois because a lot of folks think that the voting rights issue is only an issue that affects the southern states or some of the more extreme political states where we've seen some very harsh efforts to decrease the access to vote.

But when you look at Illinois, as you'll



see and as you said, there are going to be a number of issues that we look at. We would love to be able to register more people and have automatic voter registration so that people have to opt out because what we want to see is a robust democracy. Like Al Smith said, There are no ills of democracy that a little more democracy can't solve, can't fix. And so when you're looking at voter registration and voter rights, let's make more people eligible. Let's knock down more barriers as opposed to placing them. Let's maybe look at the issue of the electoral college. How Democratic is that?

So there's issues that may relate to a number of direct issues of the day and something that may be more long-term, but I am very glad and very pleased to see that this State Advisory

Committee, and I know a number of your sister state advisory committees across the country are looking at this.

So I hope the mothership sees this and begins to focus this year and in the coming year on voting rights because it's going to have a greater impact as we all have already begin to see.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

work because of the work that you all do. So I appreciate that, too. Thank you. CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much, Marty. We appreciate it. We appreciate your service. I have to say from a personal standpoint that since your appointment several years ago, I think the issues of civil rights came to another level of prominence than they were before that. appreciate your service as well.

So thank you for the opportunity to say a

Thank you for the service that you put here

few words. Good to see you all. Keep up the good

in Illinois, but really you serve all the people in

accepting the invitation. They can only do their

the United States, and thank you for all for

With that said, without further ado, I'm going to summarize the rules because you weren't here in the morning. What we'll do is each one of vou will get 12 minutes to present your piece. we'll do -- everyone will present and then we'll have time for question and answer between the tables here. And in terms of statements that might be degrading or going off the topic, I will hold the prerogative to stop any statements of that kind

So we



or we'll give authority to the Committee members as well to speak up. We haven't had that issue. We don't think we will.

That said, once we do finish your testimony, every Committee member here gets one question plus a follow-up. And then given any time at the end, as I said this morning, when there are rules, sometimes we can bend those, so if there's time allotted, then others can ask further questions if they wanted to follow up.

So with that, I do want to introduce each of our speakers. They are Mary Schaafsma from the League of Women Voters of Illinois. We have Mr. Juan Thomas from the NAACP. We have Mr. Christian Diaz, formerly of Chicago Votes. We have Ms. Sharon Legenza from Housing Action Illinois. And we have Ms. Cheryl Jansen from Equip for Equality. Thank you all for being here today.

We're going to start to your right with Ms. Mary Schaafsma. And the floor is yours for the first 12 minutes.

MS. SCHAAFSMA: Thank you. I can't hear in my own ears.

MR. KAZMI: Eat the mic more.



MS. SCHAAFSMA: Eat the mic more. Somebody said put it right up to your chin which seems

really odd, but I'll try to do that.

Good afternoon. My name is

Mary Schaafsma, and I'm the Executive Director of
the League of Women Voters of Illinois. Thank you
to the Advisory Committee -- the Illinois Advisory
Committee for this opportunity, and I'm also
honored to join colleagues on this panel.

The League of Women Voters was founded in Chicago in February 1920 at the Pick Congress Hotel. The founding occurred six months before the final ratification of the 19th Amendment extended the right to vote to women. The League offered itself as a mighty political experiment designed to help the 20 million newly franchised women carry out their responsibilities as voters. The suffragists who founded the League believed that citizenship played a crucial role in advocacy, democracy, and civic engagement.

Nearly a hundred years a later, that is still the mission of the League. The League of Women Voters stands firm in its belief that voting is bedrock to democracy. That is a civil right



that must be encouraged and protected. Voting must be free, fair, and accessible to all those entitled to vote, and an election should offer meaningful choices for voters.

To that end, the League supports uniformity of election laws and procedures in all jurisdictions throughout Illinois. Registration and voting methods should ensure the integrity of the election process, maximize voters free access to the ballot, preserve the secrecy of the ballot, and ensure accurate and timely vote tabulation.

Individuals and organizations should have the right to file complaints and writs of mandamus to force compliance with election laws. The League supports an efficient, practical, and regular election schedule. At each polling place, there should be election judges for more than one of the major political parties. The League supports mandatory training and periodic retraining of all election judges. In tabulating votes, any mark or other indication that clearly shows the intent of the voter should be counted.

The Illinois League has members in
40 local leagues throughout the state, and because



it is central to our mission, election monitoring and observation are priorities.

Recent observations and comments. First, Illinois voters enjoy the chance to vote early which provides greater flexibility and convenience, although some consistency across jurisdictions about the dates and hours during which this option is available would be useful. Illinois allows same-day registration which has the potential to increase voter turnout; but during the 2016 primary election, several election jurisdictions had an inadequate supply of ballots including Adams and Champaign counties. Why did this happen? Budget constraints; unintended partisan decisions.

Have current budget constraints resulted in voter confusion occasioned by multiple precincts in one polling place? What happens to provisional ballots? Are they counted? Has the same-day registration option made the casting of provisional ballot essentially moot? Ensuring consistent regular election judge training and recruitment that take language assistance necessity into account is essential, particularly given the fact that we now have a same-day voter registration



option.

In Illinois, each election jurisdiction has discretion in implementing certain aspects of election law and procedure. The League believes that uniformity among jurisdictions should be a goal.

Since claims of voter fraud have arisen and persist, is there or should there be a better system of ensuring the currency of voter rolls?

How well is ERIC assisting efforts in Illinois?

Leagues across Illinois in the main enjoy cordial working relationships with many clerks and election authorities. We certainly appreciate their support particularly at our high school mock election program. But there are other less tangible barriers to voting that are not as much of the administration of the elections as they are about voter access, interest, and turnout.

The lack of civil discourse in elections most certainly affects voter turnout. Election campaigns should be an opportunity for voters to witness honest, straightforward conversation and debate about the issues of the day, not the vitriol that has attended many recent campaigns. The



process of redistricting in Illinois tends to reduce of number of competitive elections, particularly in state legislative state races. Voters have fewer options, and in noncompetitive races, voters can be disinclined to value the significance of their vote.

The League encourages women to run for public office, but they, like men, are challenged by the need to raise money to mount a serious campaign. The Illinois legislature should seriously address campaign finance reform in a meaningful way, something that it has avoided doing for too long.

also poses a disadvantage to potential candidates. State law limits the ability to run for public office because the confusing, time-consuming process of signature gathering discourage men and women from running for public office.

Voter suppression comes in many different forms.

I hope on behalf of the League of Women Voters, those being raised here today from all of us offer all of us a chance to work together as we



address them and offer meaningful solutions.

Thank you again for the opportunity.

Thank you especially to the Advisory Committee for scheduling these hearings and taking the time to advocate policy makers and others to focus on civil rights and voting. Democracy depends on it.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much, Ms. Schaafsma, for your comments.

So Mr. Thomas, the microphone is yours. You have 12 minutes.

MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon. Again, my name is Juan Thomas. I want to thank this Advisory Committee to this Commission for inviting me on behalf of the Illinois Conference of the NAACP to testify regarding voting rights in Illinois. I want to thank and acknowledge our Illinois State Conference President Theresa Haley and thank her for allowing me the opportunity to represent our state conference today to discuss this very important topic.

I serve on the State Conference Executive

Committee and as chair of our Legal Redress

Committee. I'm also a practicing attorney and just recently became of counsel to the Law Firm of



Quintairos, Pietro, Wood & Boyer here in Chicago which is the largest minority women-owned law firm in the country.

More than 40 years after our ancestors were freed and 12 years after the Supreme Court Plessy versus Ferguson case that legalized formal segregation under the doctrine of "separate but equal", a race riot of 1908 in Springfield, Illinois, became the catalyst that led to the formation of the NAACP. Although there were many serious racial riots throughout the country, the one in Springfield, Illinois, was the most frightening race riot of all according to Julian Bond who served as chair of our Board of Directors before he passed away.

With the NAACP, which is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the country, the headline story of November 8th was not merely President Trump's triumph or Hillary Clinton's succession but, rather, the millions of Americans who were unable and who unnecessarily struggled to cast their vote because of a badly broken Voting Rights Act.

Without any questioning -- without in any



way questioning the legitimacy of the election's outcome, Americans must be concerned about the number of suppressed votes particularly relative to the popular vote. Throughout this past election season, the NAACP was confronted with numerous unconstitutional voter suppression issues including voter perjury -- vote purging, intimidation, and misinformation. This became a serious issue in the African-American community where there were intentional allegations regarding suppressing the right to vote.

The NAACP will not be distracted or dissuaded to continue the work to fight for voting rights for all Americans throughout this country and in Illinois. On election day, volunteers from all across the country and in Illinois were at the command center and on the ground across the country to assist people with the right to vote and make sure that they were not having any issues at polling places or missing registrations or absent election judges in hour-long waiting lines.

The NAACP also prevailed in federal courts against voter suppression no less than nine times in recent months. Not only in Texas, but also



North Carolina, our state conference saved nearly 5 percent of the electorate when the U.S. Appeals Court of the Fourth Circuit ruled that the state legislature had enacted discriminatory voting laws that intentionally targeted and disenfranchised African-American voters.

History will not only judge us on how we respond to this matter historically but also in the future. All together, we mobilized over 2 million activists, legal activists as well, and also created half a million card-carrying members, 2,000 local units to help protect the right to vote this past election cycle.

The NAACP is very concerned about the badly broken Voting Rights Act. We could not afford to send untold teams of lawyers to court and spend incalculable sums of money to defend our right to vote in court and in the streets again and again and again. This is because under the current structure and because of the Shelby decision, we are now relying solely on Section 3 of the Voting Rights Act which requires litigants to file actions after the fact once an issue of discrimination has been caused in the polling place or in their state.



the hands of law makers, judges or everyday people must continue to be considered unjust and unacceptable. The NAACP will not rest until full and equal voting rights are restored for each and every American.

Specifically, here in Illinois, the NAACP

Any effort to suppress the vote whether at

is working to register, educate, and mobilize voters throughout the state. According to the 2014 voter registration records, 35 percent of eligible African-American voters were not registered to vote. In other words, of the 1.2 million African-Americans that are registered -- that are eligible to be registered to vote, 424,132 African-Americans in Illinois are not registered to vote. We are working to close -- to shrink this number.

Specifically, we are also in support of bipartisan legislation that would establish a system of automatic voter registration and make it easier for millions of Illinois residents to exercise their right to vote. We were disappointed that Governor Rauner vetoed this legislation last August, and we are hoping that this will become --



will be reintroduced this General Assembly and become law. It is important that we advocate to support this type of legislation because we believe it's necessary to protect voting rights in Illinois.

In conclusion, I would like to draw this Committee's attention to a report done by the Chicago Lawyers Committee, the Joyce Foundation, MALDEF, and Advancing Justice, a report that came out in 2015 titled the Color of Representation. Local Government in Illinois. This report highlights the impact of voting and the lack of peoples of color votes with respect to their representation on the local level of government. It highlights a variety of different counties throughout the state where African-American and Latino votes are not only suppressed, but also marginalized in a way that does not create fair and equal representation based upon peoples of colors population numbers.

with that, I thank you again for this opportunity and look forward to your questions.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much,
Mr. Thomas. We now have Mr. Christian Diaz. You



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have the microphone for the next 12 minutes.

MR. DIAZ: Thank you. So, again, my name is Christian Diaz. I'm formerly the Executive Director of Chicago Votes, and I want to start off by thanking the Illinois Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for putting together this really important event, and I'm honored -- we are honored to be here to be able to testify.

So Chicago Votes was founded in 2012. We are a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization building more inclusive democracy by putting power in the hands of young people. We seek to make sure that our elections are more secure, more efficient, and more accurate through common sense democracy reforms, like online voter registration and election day voter registration.

Since 2012, Chicago Votes has registered over 25,000 young -- or people to vote and trained hundreds of leaders to work in government and politics in the nonprofit sector. Additionally, we've distributed over almost 200,000 nonpartisan voter guides. We also work directly with civic teachers in CPS classrooms to provide capacity and



support for meaningful service learning programs that incorporate research, planning, execution, and reflection to complement civic education in young people.

We believe democracy reforms, leadership development, and education and partnerships with institutions are what will change this trend in voter participation among young people.

So what is the need? According to the 2011 Illinois Civic Health Index, Illinois ranked 13th in the nation out of 51 states in terms of young people discussing community issues with their friends and family. According to the same study, Illinois ranks 47th in the nation in terms of young people participating in local elections. What does this tell us? What barriers prevent young people from participating in elections? And what is the impact of low voter turnout? These are important questions that we need to ask ourselves.

But, first, I should start by clarifying, you know, what is a Millennial. For today's purposes, I'm referring to young people between the ages of 18 and 35. In 2015 -- in 2015, Millennials surpassed Baby Boomers as the largest living



generation in history with 75.4 million young people in this country compared to 74.9 million Baby Boomers. By 2036, it is estimated that this will increase to 81.1 million Millennials making our generation the largest voting block in history.

But study after study shows that a lot of work still needs to be done to increase civic participation among this generation. The truth is, the young people care a lot. UCLA's 2015 survey of first year college students in the U.S. found interest in political and civic engagement has reached the highest level since the study began 50 years ago. Illinois Millennials are more likely to volunteer than their national peers, 21.3 percent. Additionally, they outpace the national average in making donations of \$25 or more to community organizations.

But how do we translate this civic interest into voting and voter participation? Well, Millennials value community service. It appears that it is -- that there is a disconnect between ideas around community service, civic responsibility, and voting. Young people don't see the political system often as relative to their



daily living conditions. A recent survey showed that only 13 percent of young people think they will run for office at some point in their lives.

We, too, must ask ourselves, what barriers prevent people from voting? According to the Pew Research Center, the United States ranks 31 out of 35 developed countries trailing most in voter turnout. Barriers that prevent people from voting include inefficient and outdated voter registration systems. Lack of opportunities — in regard to youth, lack of opportunities for meaningful civic education, and a disconnection between constituents and the political parties that aim to represent them.

I also want to note that equity as always is very important in this conversation. Voter turnout among young people varies drastically by education, income, race, and ethnicity. Historically marginalized communities suffer from civic empowerment gaps across age groups but markedly so among young people. As early as the 4th grade and continuing into 8th and 12th grade, African-American, Hispanic, and poor students perform significantly worse on tests of civic



knowledge than their white, Asian, and middle-class peers.

Considerable studies show living in areas of concentrated poverty are significantly less likely to be -- people living in areas of concentrated poverty are significantly less likely to be civically engaged and have less opportunities for meaningful civic engagement. Experiences that promote civic readiness are overwhelmingly distributed in favor of affluent communities.

This creates a cycle in which people living in poverty face enormous challenges to civic participation including instability in their housing as well as having to work multiple jobs. The effect is that when young people don't participate, candidates don't believe they need to win the vote of this demographic in order to be elected into office; and, in return, they don't -- they sometimes don't take into consideration the needs of that demographic because they're not voting. And so this creates a cycle and a trap where poverty begets low civic participation and, in return, low civic participation reinforces systems that have created communities that live in



poverty.

what is the impact of low voter participation among young people? Studies show a direct correlation between civic participation and the well-being of a community across health, education, and income. Access to high quality civic education and service learning opportunities increase a student's likelihood of graduating from high school and acquiring a degree in higher education. Civic education develops collaboration, communication, deliberation, and critical thinking skills that best prepare students for higher education as well as the work force.

Civic health refers to a young person's connectedness to their neighbors and to elected officials, for example, and so we must strive to increase the civic health of young people in our state. But we are making progress.

Looking at the Illinois 2016 primary, we see that democracy reform, civic education, and civic engagement lead to higher youth voter turnout. The March 15th Illinois primary election surpassed previous records by 6 percentage points in youth voter turnout. And Illinois represents



the second largest increase nationally in youth voter turnout among -- in primary elections.

So why the higher rate of voter participation on March 15th? We believe that democracy reforms such as online voter registration, grace period early voting and registration, election day voter registration created conditions in which more people could have more choices to choose what form of voting is best suited for their lifestyle.

80 percent of registrations leading up to the primary election on March 15th happened on line. Additionally, 110,000 people used election day voter registration on March 15th. And we can ask ourselves, if these policies weren't in place, how would these folks have had access to the ballot?

We believe that increased opportunities for civic education, leadership development, and civic action elevate the voices of young people and make elections more relevant to their lived experience, thus increasing voter participation.

Organizations and efforts like those of Chicago Votes, Mikva Challenge, and the Chicago Public



Schools' Department of Social Science and Civic Engagement give opportunities for young people to understand government and elections as well as the tools to communicate issues that impact young people to candidates and elected officials.

In conclusion, our recommendations for increasing voter participation not just among young people but across all communities include modernizing elections through common sense reforms such as automatic voter registration and public financing for campaigns. Automatic voter registration is a policy that will make our election system in Illinois more accurate, more efficient, and more secure.

We also believe that the states should increase funding for organizations and institutions to increase their capacity to provide meaningful civic education to young people.

Finally, we must address the significant disparity in income, education, and historically disenfranchised communities if you want to make further progress. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, Mr. Diaz. We appreciate it.



Ms. Legenza, you have the microphone. You have 12 minutes.

MS. LEGENZA: Can everyone hear me? Well, good afternoon. I want to echo the thanks of my panelists to the Illinois Advisory Committee for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for holding this important day of hearing on voting rights in Illinois; but I particularly want to thank you for including a particularly overlooked group which is those experiencing homelessness in Illinois.

So my name is Sharon Legenza, and I'm the Executive Director of Housing Action Illinois. For 30 years, Housing Action has worked to expand and preserve fair, accessible, and affordable housing for all Illinois residents, but particularly those with the lowest incomes. We are a statewide coalition with over 150 member organizations including nonprofit affordable housing developers, helping housing agencies, and homeless and supportive service providers. Together, we believe that we are stronger to advance equitable housing solutions for all Illinois residents.

So I want to kind of have my talk broken up a little bit to give you some information about



who are homeless individuals in Illinois and what are the numbers, what are some of the challenges that they -- what the law is in Illinois regarding their rights to vote, what some of the challenges are, barriers, and then some possible solutions.

So as you can probably imagine, it's difficult to determine definitively the number of people experiencing homelessness on any given night. This is because the population includes not only those that are unsheltered, and, by that, we mean living on the streets or in cars or abandoned buildings, generally places that are not considered habitable for humans, but it also includes those that are temporarily sheltered in emergency shelters, transitional housing or supportive housing situations. And the definition of homeless also includes those who are doubled up by living with friends or relatives.

So this population can be very transitory, moving from place to place regardless of whether they are sheltered or unsheltered. Generally speaking, homelessness is caused by high levels of competition for housing resources and the need to avoid unmanageable housing cost burdens.



So every year, homeless service providers and volunteers throughout the state engage in what's called a point-in-time count. This is an effort to count the individuals experiencing homelessness on a particular night in January. The point-in-time count includes those who are unsheltered as well as those who are living in emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing.

Based on the 2016 point-in-time column, there were 11,590 individuals in our state experiencing homelessness. A majority of the persons identified as homeless at that point-in-time count were staying in emergency shelters or transitional housing, but many were also unsheltered. Importantly, veterans make up 8 percent of this count or 949 people.

The point-in-time numbers do not include the even larger number of people in poverty living doubled up with friends and relatives. According to the U.S. Census, the number of people in poverty living doubled up in Illinois in 2014 was 259,484. Again, 259,484.

Doubled up households have a high risk of



homelessness. Nationally, living with friends or family due to economic need is the most often cited previous living situation for individuals and families entering the homeless system.

So just focusing on Chicago specifically, because I have some more specific breakdowns, the nonprofit organization, All Chicago Making Homelessness History, reports that about half of the people in the 2016 point-in-time count reside in Chicago. So 5,889 people experience homelessness on the street or in shelters in Chicago. 66 percent are male. 34 percent are female. .5 percent are transgender. 74 percent are African-American. 15 percent are white. And 11 percent are Hispanic. 53 percent of homeless men and 26 percent of homeless women report having spent time in jail or prison. And veterans comprise 14 percent or a higher percentage of Chicago's homeless population. Again, this data does not include those who are doubled up and living with friends and relatives.

So as you can see, there are significant numbers of people experiencing homelessness throughout Illinois, and there's also a significant



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

overlap in terms of minority populations, prior interaction with the criminal justice system, and veterans status, and I know you had some speakers on that earlier today.

So in Illinois, we specifically recognize the voting rights of people experiencing homelessness as enacted in the Bill of Rights for the Homeless Act. The Bill of Rights for the Homeless states, in relevant part, "No person's rights, privileges or access to public services may be denied or abridged solely because he or she is homeless. Such a person shall be granted the same rights and privileges as any other citizen of the state."

A person experiencing homelessness has the right to vote, register to vote, and receive documentation necessary to prove identity for voting without discrimination due to his or her housing status.

Generally speaking, this right has been operationalized so that in order to register a person experiencing homelessness can use an address where he or she is able to receive mail such as a shelter or a friend's house as the address on the



voter registration form. Once registered, the voter's polling place is based on the address provided on the registration form.

So although Illinois has a legal frame allowing homeless individuals the right to vote, there remain challenges and barriers to this population fully realizing that right. After speaking with homeless service providers and advocates around the state, these challenges include lack of awareness of rights, identification documentation issues, difficulty traveling to polling places, and inconsistent knowledge on the part of election judges and on-site staff. So lack of awareness.

It appears that many people experiencing homelessness do not know that they have the right to vote and this may be because they do not have a permanent residence. One advocate stated that in her organization's experience, homeless individuals are enthused to register and actually do register when they learn that they can, but that generally there's a lack of information about voting rights.

For example, this past year, the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless participated in a voter



registration effort launched during national homeless and low-income voter week. As a result of their education and outreach, over 400 homeless people in Chicago registered to vote. To do this, Chicago Coalition's staff and volunteers went to more than 20 shelters and community sites throughout Chicago.

This broad education and outreach effort, however, takes resources which then falls onto homeless service providers and advocates who are often already underresourced and overstretched. I want to make sure I get that right. So it's hard to rely on those types of efforts.

So maintaining proper and up-to-date identification is also often a challenge for many homeless individuals. Illinois provides homeless individuals the opportunity to obtain a state ID free of charge by using the Homeless Status Certification which is very helpful and has been used for people residing or receiving services from a social service agency. But some of the supporting documentation required for this form, like a birth certificate, costs money which many individuals do not have.



_

In addition, further moves make it challenging to ensure that all the identification is up to date so it can cause kind of a feedback loop in terms of making sure that you have the right identification.

Another barrier to voting is difficulty in physically getting to polling places particularly in areas where you can't walk or are not served by mass transit. One homeless service agency deals with this by having volunteers drive residents who wish to vote to the polling places in their suburban area. But not all the agencies have the resources to do this service and not all homeless individuals reside or receive services from a social service agency.

Election judges and staff often need more training to understand and consistently apply the rules regarding voting rights for people experiencing homelessness.

On election day 2016, the Election

Protection Program run by the Chicago Lawyers

Committee for Civil Rights fielded multiple calls

from homeless voters. In one instance, a voter was

staying temporarily with a friend but did not have



official documentation or mail tying him to that friend's address. When the voter arrived at the polling site, the election judges were not familiar with the provision of Illinois election law that allows homeless voters to vote in a precinct where they are authorized to receive mail. In this situation, fortunately, the voter, the friend, the election judge, and the election protection worker were all able to get on the phone and figure out what was going on and get the proper documentation so the voter was able to register and cast a full ballot that day.

But many of the ways to address barriers for people experiencing homelessness will also help other populations as well. The ultimate goal must be to decrease barriers to exercising the right to vote while ensuring the integrity of the voting process.

so the voting rights of people experiencing homelessness could be strengthened by increased statewide outreach and education, increased training of election judges and onsite staff, adopting automatic voter registration. As you might imagine, people experiencing homelessness



_

interact with a variety of state agencies, and this would very much simplify the process for them.

Allowing election day registration.

Again, it simplifies the process for them so they

don't have to have multiple trips or go to multiple

sites to try to register and then vote.

So the final item would be providing for range of options of when, where, and how to vote. Allowing for early voting, a range of potential polling places, and mail-in voting would assist homelessness people to exercise their franchise.

So protecting the integrity of our electoral process is important, and this goal can be achieved by common sense policies that are sensitive to the unique circumstances of homeless individuals without imposing undue burdens on them.

So I just met my one-minute mark. So I want to thank you for this opportunity. I look forward to answering any questions you might have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much,
Ms. Legenza. We appreciate your time.

Ms. Jansen, you have the microphone. You have 12 minutes.



MS. JANSEN: Good afternoon, members of the Committee. Thank you very much for convening this hearing and providing us with an opportunity to talk with you about issues that voters with disabilities face in the State of Illinois.

My name is Cheryl Jansen, and I'm the Public Policy Director at Equip for Equality. And Equip is the independent nonprofit organization designated by the Governor to implement the federally mandated protection and advocacy system for people with disabilities in the State of Illinois. Our mission is to advance this civil and human rights of children and adults with disabilities across the state.

We have been actively working to ensure that people with disabilities have full and equal access to the electoral process since we were founded in 1985. We provide voting rights training and education to voters with disabilities, their families, election and other public officials, and service provider agencies, both public and private. We conduct voter registration, engage in poll watching, conduct polling place accessibility surveys, operate an election day help line for



voters with disabilities to assist them in exercising their right to vote.

For the 2016 general election, we partnered with the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners in a project called Voting Access Chicago. The aim of that project is to make all polling places in the City of Chicago fully accessible to people with disabilities by the year 2018. For that project, we recruited, trained, and deployed over 250 volunteers and staff to conduct ADA accessibility surveys of over 1900 polling places on election day in the City of Chicago. Our voting rights work is really vital to our mission.

Historically, people with disabilities have been underrepresented at the polls. People with disabilities are more likely to report that they have encountered or expect to encounter problems when they go to vote.

By way of example, in the 2012 election, 30 percent of people with disabilities reported difficulty in voting compared to 8 percent of people without disabilities. Based upon U.S. Census Bureau data, 15.6 million people with disabilities voted in the 2012 presidential



election. That represents only 57 percent of eligible voters with disabilities. In contrast, 63 percent of eligible voters without disabilities voted in that election. And the practical effect of that disparity is that if voters with disabilities had voted at the same rate in that election as people without disabilities, there would have been 3 million more people with disabilities voting in that election.

This isn't to say that there has been no progress. There certainly has. Throughout the years, we have seen advances in the electoral system in the State of Illinois that have allowed many people fuller access to the electoral process.

However, some issues persist, and they are inaccessibility of polling places, problems with the accessible or electronic voting equipment, inadequate training of election judges, discriminatory attitudes and practices of election judges, family members, and guardians, and lack of transportation to the polls on election day.

So even with the enactment of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 and expanded opportunities to register and vote under state law, for instance,



registration and voting by mail, expanded opportunities for early voting and same day registration and voting, people with disabilities continue to be underrepresented at the polls.

So I would like to look more closely at some of the barriers I've identified starting with the inaccessibility of polling places.

Unfortunately, the most recent national data available indicates that at the time of the 2008 election, less than a third of all polling places in the U.S. were barrier free. I would certainly like to think that those numbers have improved since 2008, but that data is not yet available.

What I do know is that based upon polling place accessibility surveys that Equip for Equality has done, consumer surveys that we have distributed and received and reports that we get from our election day help line, there's no question that physical access to polling places continues to be a serious issue for voters with disabilities in Illinois.

And in many instances, the physical access issues encountered by voters with disabilities could be remedied by very simple measures at a very



low cost. For example, providing a parking area for voters with disabilities with clear signage that exhibits the international symbol for disability access. Positioning the accessible voting machine in a way that provides unimpeded access and also privacy. Providing a working doorbell at the polling place entrance so that voters with disabilities who require assistance to enter can alert the election judges that they are there.

These types of physical barriers not only thwart voting by people with disabilities, but they also signal to people with disabilities that they're not equal or welcome participants in the electoral process.

With the termination of funding under the federal Help America Vote Act, funding to states -- excuse me, with the termination of that funding to states and local units of government to make polling places accessible including path travel, entrances, exits and the actual voting area of each polling place, there are fewer resources and, frankly, fewer incentive for local election authorities to remedy these problems.



1 | 2 | here | 3 | I would | Act | n | 5 | with | 6 | that | 7 | disable | 8 | manne | 9 | priva | 10 | disable | 11 | acces | 12 | inves | 12 | inves | 12 | inves | 13 | disable | 14 | acces | 15 | inves | 15 | inves | 16 | disable | 17 | disable | 18 | disable | 18 | disable | 19 | disable | 19 | disable | 10 | disabl

I think there's been a recurrent theme here about inadequate election judge training, and I would like to echo that. The Help America Vote Act mandates that every polling place be equipped with at least one electronic voting machine, but that doesn't necessarily mean that people with disabilities have the ability to vote in the same manner as people without disabilities including privately and independently. Voters with disabilities frequently report that the so-called accessible machine does not work, although upon investigation, sometimes it's as simple as plugging in the machine, or that election judges don't know how to start or operate the machine.

Voters with disabilities report being asked to wait for 30 minutes or more while an election judge tries to troubleshoot the machine or waits for a technician to come and repair that machine. Some voters have been asked to come back at another time to vote.

We have encountered election judges who failed to display or offer aids to voters with disabilities such as a magnifying lens to someone with a visual impairment or election judges who



question the right of the voter with a disability to be assisted by a person of his or her choosing which is a right guaranteed under law; and we've also observed election judges challenging the right of a person with a disability to vote.

In part, this is surely a result of inadequate election judge training, but it's also due to a lack of funding that would allow election authorities to provide proper technical support to repair or replace what is now aging voting equipment.

All of these factors contribute to lower levels of participation in the electoral process for people with disabilities, and all of them demonstrate a critical need to improve and increase the education and training of election authorities and election judges in a way that will promote and not deter voting by people with disabilities.

A commonly cited reason for people with disabilities not voting is a lack of transportation to the polling place which, in turn, is tied to the lower income levels of many people with disabilities. Although vote by mail is now an option for all qualified voters in Illinois with no



excuse or reason required and early voting opportunities have been expanded, many voters with disabilities and those without disabilities find it a poor substitute for engaging in the voting process along with their fellow citizens on election day.

expressed objections to curb-side voting for that reason along with privacy concerns. While early voting provides people with disabilities some flexibility as to when they vote, it still requires access to transportation; and the lack of accessible transportation that is affordable and reliable is not an issue that's addressed by the Help America Vote Act or by state law. However, for voters with disabilities to become full and equal participants in the electoral process, it is an issue that needs to be recognized and addressed.

So in conclusion, although strides have been made since the Help America Vote Act was passed 15 years ago, voters with disabilities continue to face obstacles to full and equal participation in the electoral process.

And so we would urge this Committee to



carefully consider these ongoing barriers in 1 2 preparing your findings and recommendations and report to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 3 4 Thank you very much. 5 CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much, Ms. Jansen. With that, we will open it up to the 6 Committee for questions. We have about 24 minutes 7 8 to do so. We hope that will take up that entire time, but if not, I'll open it up for final 9 10 comments as well. So with that, are there any 11 initial questions? Mr. Kazmi. 12 Mr. Thomas, quick question for you. MR. KAZMI: 13 Prior to the break, we had heard about racial disparities obviously and incarceration rates but 14 as a result in voting. You say that 35 percent of 15 16 African-Americans that were eligible were not 17 registered to vote. That 35 percent, if we read it 18 literally that were eligible did not count those that were also incarcerated, right? Or does it 19 20 also include individuals who are incarcerated who, 21 you know, don't have the ability to vote but may 22 not be registered or are registered? 23 CHAIRMAN LINARES: Can we pass the microphone? 24 I'm wondering because what's sad MR. KAZMI:



about this is it's even greater, it's worse than
what we think it is. So if that's the case, I'm
just asking, does this 35 percent include those who
are incarcerated as well?

MR. THOMAS: Based upon my information, I do not know, but I can find that out. From what -- it's my understanding it does not include the incarcerated.

MR. KAZMI: I didn't think so, too.

MR. THOMAS: But I'll confirm that.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Other questions?

Mr. Nevels?

MR. NEVELS: This is a -- so this is kind of an observation and a question. So as I've been sitting here listening to testimony from a number of different organizations that represent varying groups that all come at voting with a different lens, there's some overlap of interest.

I guess my question, is there space where all these various groups get together to discuss voter protection, voter registration for their particular interest group and then identify ways to collaborate moving legislation forward which would be comprehensive -- I'm talking maybe state



legislation -- that's comprehensive and would offer protection across these different interest groups?

MR. DIAZ: I guess I'll make a plug for our coalition, the Just Democracy Illinois Coalition, which I believe includes several panelists today is a collaborative between different interest groups whether it be public policy or constituent services, and there is a table that inspires collaboration across these different organizations; and it is actually this Coalition that did a lot of the leg work to advance on-line voter registration in 2013, election day registration in 2014 and is, today, leading the campaign to win automatic voter registration in Illinois.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Buys?

MS. BUYS: So as Ms. Jansen said, the need for better training of election judges is a common theme, and so I'm wondering if anyone on the panel can tell us a little bit more about how election judges are trained. Is that done on a statewide level? Is that done at a local level? Who funds it, that sort of thing?

MS. SCHAAFSMA: I think one of the issues in Illinois that we really could have a better look



at, right now there are more than 110 election jurisdictions in Illinois, and while they are subject universally to the state election laws, there is I think a lack of central authority on how those laws get -- and processes get implemented.

So, for example, every jurisdiction has the authority to select voting equipment of their choice. Every jurisdiction can set the hours and time, length of time for early voting. And I think that is -- and so each jurisdiction then by extension also does its own election judge training. And I see that Mr. Orr is already in the audience with us and representing Cook County probably can say how Cook County does it.

But I think an overarching issue here is the lack of funding. So that election judges in some places are trained only once, so there's not a retraining process; and I think that because of budget constraints, there are things that could happen that aren't happening because of that. And as the laws rapidly change and as some things get replaced with other things, there's some confusion at the polls.

I think that there is a whole



constellation of issues that are affected here.

One of the issues that I raised, what happens when
there are more -- when there's more than one or
several precincts in the same polling place.

I had experience with that not so long ago where I was given the wrong ballot, and because I work for the League of Women Voters, I knew it was the wrong ballot. I'm not sure how many voters are really -- and it's not because they're not sophisticated. It's just that they're not engaged for all the numbers of reasons that we've heard. And the election judge said to me, well, it really doesn't matter because that person is going to win anyway. And to sort of have that value judgment raised -- and I was horrified. I said, no, I don't want this ballot. I want the ballot to which I'm entitled. And she was like, oh, this is just going to be extra work for me.

And I understand that and I have total sympathy with it and I have total sympathy with election jurisdictions that are challenged by this; but at the end of this day, voting is a fundamental right, and the erosion on people's ability to access voting, to have information about voting



should be paramount because there are so many other pressures on us that tamp back and suppress the vote. And so I think election judge training is really at the top of the list.

MR. THOMAS: Can I add to that? Not only is that an issue with respect to election judges, but there are some parts of our state where there are certain cities and municipalities that are in different counties, and that also impacts voter information with respect to where they should go vote for early voting.

I know where I live, I live in Aurora, and Aurora is in four different counties. We're in Kane, DuPage, Kendall, and a portion of Will; and then depending on where you live in that community, if you early vote, you have to go to either the Will County Clerk's office or the Kane County Clerk's office, and sometimes that's not explained to voters in a way that they fully understand.

There's also municipal elections where the Aurora Election Commission governs versus the Kane County, which is also true in Naperville. So I can't speak to Cook County or Chicago particularly -- same issue?



MR. KAZMI: Yes.

MR. THOMAS: This is confusing to us. This is confusing sometimes for election officials because sometimes voters are told to go to the wrong place to go early vote or to register to vote or to change their voter registration information.

It's something that I think we need to look at as a state because there's just a lot of overlap and confusion.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Jansen wanted to answer something.

MS. JANSEN: One thing I wanted to add was when you talk about increasing and improving election judge training, I think, you know, a part of that is finding a way to recruit and attract new people to serve as election judges. Because I will tell you from personal experience and having been an election judge that frequently the people who are election judges have done it for many, many years and have done it a certain way for many, many years and aren't necessarily amenable to change.

And so I think it really behooves us as part of that effort to look at ways that we can really make people interested and willing to be



engaged and invest the time on election day to spend working as an election judge. I think that would be helpful as well.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you for those comments. Mr. Cobb had a question.

MR. COBB: Good afternoon. Thank you all for your testimony. So I want to go in a slightly different direction because we've heard part of it today about access, and we heard some this morning about prison gerrymandering and redistricting, really some great topics, but there are a couple of things that came up from a few of the comments that I want to go over about tabulation of provisional ballots and the actual counting of the votes once they're in.

So I'm curious, have the recent changes and same day voter registration had any impact on maybe an increase or decrease in provisional ballots or any additional concerns that ballots aren't being appropriately tabulated and counted? So if any of you wants to speak to that, I'd appreciate it.

MS. SCHAAFSMA: We at the League share that concern because we have heard anecdotally that



provisional ballots are not counted and that they're packed up in boxes and put on a shelf somewhere. There's also -- and I don't know if same day registration has made that essentially obsolete.

I think part of the reason why provisional ballots are so confusing is that election judges aren't aware of all of the options for which they should be provided. It's my understanding that sometimes an election judge will take the provisional ballot. Other times they will send the person to where they think the precinct is. And I know there's been a lot of confusion around that with all of these precinct location changes is that information about where to go to vote is not made available at the first — the first place where a voter goes, and we hear stories.

Again, one of the things I think that all of us would like to see is an evaluation of some of these voting processes. And I'm not sure there's been any statewide work done to say what happens in Cook County is one thing, what happens in Adams County or what happens in some of these smaller counties in terms of how provisional



ballots are used, I have not seen any statistic on that, and I would be really happy to see that.

and they are given a provisional ballot, I would assume if I were that voter that when I leave the precinct that my vote is going to be counted. And if it is true that those votes aren't counted for whatever reasons -- and, again, I think the overarch here is a lack of resources that's made available in an increasingly worsening environment where we can't fund basic services. Again, voting is so fundamental that that should receive a priority and I don't think that it does.

I mean, we could opine for a while on some of the reasons, and I think it could take us, you know, two days to sort of share what we think some of those reasons are for why some of these basic services may be underfunded or lack of education of the people who administer the programs.

MS. LEGENZA: So I would just add in this last election, I think there was confusion caused by a court challenge for the same day registration law. So that it's on the books, but then it was challenged, and it was unclear whether it was going



forward, and then the 7th Circuit stayed -- allowed it to go forth in this election.

So as you investigate this, I think that the status of the law in courts cause perhaps some confusion on the part of election officials and the election judges, and the fact that we have 110 different jurisdictions and kind of what's going on. So I would add that kind of piece of history.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Rodriguez had a question.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: I think what's become evident at least for me to this conversation is the importance of training election judges to ensure that there is an accessibility through all groups that you represent.

Mr. Diaz, you mentioned the rights of the Millennial block, the voting block, but I'm curious if anyone can answer in terms of the efforts through your agencies to ensure there's, indeed, that engagement piece to train a new Millennial population to become election judges to be aware of these issues that are coming up. So if you could speak to those efforts.

MR. DIAZ: I'm not extremely familiar with the



program, but I do know that Mikva Challenge does recruit high school students from Chicago Public Schools and trains them to be election judges and to work at polling booths on election day. That seems to be a really great program. That is definitely promoting civic education among young people, and I think at the same time building young leaders that can be ambassadors in their communities and schools and for their families to orient people as to how they can cast a ballot and what their rights are.

I do think there is an opportunity to increase or to expand that program to include students at the City Colleges of Chicago, and that would be a really exciting project to see come to life in the future.

MR. THOMAS: I can tell you that in light of, as I look around at this partisan crowd here today, but in light of the election results from November 8th, there has been increased numbers of participants attending our local branch meetings of the NAACP. I can tell you that my friends in partisan politics have told me that at their monthly meetings there have been places where



there's no seats available because people are coming to the local Democratic Party meeting.

And so those organizations are trying to channel efforts to get people engaged and find instructive ways for them to participate, including becoming deputy registrars, election judges, and so forth. This is happening not just in Cook County, but I can tell you it's happening in Naperville. A friend of mine who is chair of the Democratic Party in Naperville just told me a few days ago that in their meeting, they had over 200 people in their meeting. They never get that kind of turnout, because people are looking for ways to participate in the political process.

MS. SCHAAFSMA: I just wanted to add one thing to this. For the longest time, Illinois did not require civics in its curriculum; and, recently, I guess it was maybe two years ago, the Illinois General Assembly and Governor Rauner signed into law a requirement that there be a stand-alone civics course in high school that in order to graduate, you have to take this stand-alone civics course.

I applaud that effort, and I think part of



what we do now is to go back to those generations
of people who didn't have civics to reintroduce
them to civics because I think the way in which our
government works is really important and can help
people to vote, to run for office and do all those
important civic engagement issues.

So on that score, I think Illinois did us
all a great favor. And I think organizations like

So on that score, I think Illinois did us all a great favor. And I think organizations like Mikva Challenge should be heralded. The League works a lot with suburban high schools to do mock elections in anticipation.

I mean, it would be interesting I think to do some kind of study that would look at those kids, those young people who engaged at that level in high school and see how their habits of voting go into the future as they vote because there's a big gap then in between that and the next step.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Any questions? Mr. Kazmi?

MR. KAZMI: Ms. Jansen, just for data purposes,
you said less than 30 percent of polling places in
America were fully accessible. Do you have a data
point for Illinois and Chicago or an estimated?

MS. JANSEN: I do not. I do not. And I'm not sure if that's available. But I would be happy to



do a little extra inquiry and provide it to you.

MR. KAZMI: If you don't mind, would you?

MS. JANSEN: I would be happy to.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Other questions? I will field a question if you don't mind. This is for Ms. Legenza. It is more of a clarification for my own notes. The 259,484 number that you informed us about, is that households or individuals in Illinois?

MS. LEGENZA: I believe that's individuals.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Then my follow-up is, is the prominent issue here with regards to the voting issue, is that with regards to the fact of address? What is the connecting issue here?

MS. LEGENZA: I think that's what it is. I think that people don't realize that they can register to vote even though they may not have a permanent address because so much of voting and where you vote kind of falls on -- and who you vote for falls on where you live, right; and people who don't have permanent housing, I think that they think that perhaps they're not entitled then to vote for some reason.

And then so the fact that they can and



it's enacted in Illinois law, it's really a matter 1 2 of greater education. And then the operational 3 issues that we talked about is making sure that everyone understands how that works once there is a 4 5 permanent -- or an accepting mail address is maybe the best way to put it, whether it's a shelter or a 6 7 friend's house or something like that. 8 Thank you. Any further CHAIRMAN LINARES: questions from the Committee? No? We have just a 9 10 few minutes left. I will open it up to you 11 panelists if there's anyone who wants to give a 12 concluding thought, you can do that now. 13 with that then, we thank you for your testimony, each one of you, Ms. Jansen, 14 15 Ms. Legenza, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Thomas, and 16 Ms. Schaafsma. We appreciate you coming out today. 17 we'll have a report written up in the next several months here which we'll, of course, share with you, 18 19 but thanks again. The session is closed. 20 convene again in 15 minutes. 21 (Off the record at 2:42 p.m.) 22 (On the record at 3:01 p.m.) 23 CHAIRMAN LINARES: We are back in session.



24

Thank you everyone for returning. We are here for

1 2

our final panel of the day, and we are thankful for our quest panelists for being here with us today.

I'm going to summarize a few of the rules that we have here, and they are, each speaker will have 12 minutes maximum to give your testimony or presentation which we very much appreciate, and I will be keeping time here. At that point, we will have a question and answer session with the panelists, with yourselves and this table. Each of the Committee members will have one question and one follow-up unless, of course, there's time left afterwards and then we'll make an amendment to that rule.

Also, the Chair has a prerogative that if there are any degrading comments or any comments that go beyond the scope of what we're discussing today that we will redirect the comments; but we have not had that issue and we don't expect to have that issue here today.

So with that, we thank you for being here. If I can introduce each one of you. First, we have Mr. Brent Davis with the Illinois State Board of Elections. Thank you for being here, sir. We have Mr. David Orr, the Cook County Clerk. Thank you

for being here. And we have Ms. Karyn Bass Ehler with the Civil Rights Bureau of the Office of the Illinois Attorney General. Thank you for being here.

With that, we'll start to your right with Mr. Davis. You have 12 minutes, and the microphone is yours.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you guys for having me. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I'm the Director of Election Operations for the State Board of Elections and my -- the division that I'm in charge of is responsible for the training program for election judges today.

I was asked to give an overview of the training program that we do offer to election judges. And walking in on the last segment, I did hear several comments, so it seems like it must have been of interest. So I am happy to entertain any questions.

Basically the goal for the State Board of Elections is to provide training in jurisdictions where they do not have resources to conduct the training themselves whether they don't have the presentation equipment or whatever the resources



may be.

In the 2016 general election, we conducted the training for 51 of the 109 jurisdictions in the state. So not quite half of them. Most of these jurisdictions are the smaller jurisdictions, again, that don't have the resources; and we don't have the resources to do it for the larger jurisdictions. Most of those are conducted by themselves.

Our presentation for election judges, it does vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction just because of the nature of Illinois elections and the nature of the election authority having the authority board for each individual jurisdiction.

A lot of times the equipment is going to vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. The procedures will sometimes vary based upon how the local county clerk or director of elections would be running that election.

But, basically, the first thing that our presentation focuses on is the basic procedures for getting the election -- the polling place set up, what comes in during the voting day, how to handle individual voters, the different affidavits that



they use, that sort of information, and then closing down the polls after 7 o'clock when the polls close.

In addition to that, one of our main focuses for -- at least of recent for helping election judges understand what their role is is there is an option for virtually every voter that comes to the polling place or that wants to vote on election day because of all the safeguards that are in Illinois elections, whether that be -- if someone has moved or if they have changed their name, most of the time they can vote right then and there simply by completing an affidavit; and we emphasize the importance of those judges understanding those affidavits, how to complete them to update the records for the county clerk's office.

In addition to that, we have grace period registration on election day. So that further will take just about any eligible Illinois citizen who is eligible to vote, can get registered on election day. Many of them are available in the polling place depending upon the jurisdiction, and if they're not available in the polling place, they



are available at a localized center maybe within the municipality or, at a minimum, at the County Clerk's office, and that again is dependent on the jurisdiction size.

The last option to make sure that we don't send anyone home without being able to exercise the right to vote is the provisional vote. And this is sort of a last chance option for when we can't come to a conclusion for that voter if they are Maybe we can't find the registration. eliaible. Maybe they come in and they want to register to vote, but they didn't bring their two forms of ID which is required for registering to vote. There's several different circumstances in which they would use a provisional. And the election judges are trained on the importance of offering that and that, again, we don't send anyone home without having a plan in place or a solution for every single person, whether it be re-registering, voting provisionally, going to the correct polling place. Because if they are in the incorrect polling place. that polling place won't necessarily have their correct ballot style, and those votes would not be counted for offices that they were not eligible to



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

vote on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In addition to those options as far as making sure that everyone is eligible to vote, there are also options for voters with disabilities. So anyone who has a disability that impairs their ability to mark the ballot has several options available to them in order to vote, and the election judges are trained on those options, the first of which are ADA-compliant machines, the voting machines. You've all seen the touch screen devices. Those machines also have head phones on them where they will read the ballot to the voter, read the different offices, the different candidates. So someone who has a visual impairment or cannot read or write the English language can have that ballot read to them, and they can either use the touch screen or the key pad device to navigate through the ballot and make their selections. So the judges are trained on that as well.

In addition to that, they are trained on the options for -- if the voter is intimidated by electronic equipment and they don't want to use that electronic equipment, which happens very



frequently, and they want to take a friend or relative into the voting booth with them, they have that option as well. The election judges are trained on allowing for a friend or relative or, if they don't have someone with them, two election judges, one of each party, can go into that voting booth with them and assist them in voting.

They are also taught the importance of the voter assistance affidavit. So in the case that someone does go into the voting booth with that voter, they are required to complete an affidavit of assistance where the voter declares that they do need assistance, that they do actually need someone to go in there with them, and that the person providing assistance is going to mark that ballot in accordance with the voter's wishes and not try to influence their vote.

In addition to those election judges, another area of emphasis are the different ballot styles that the election judges are using on election day. One of the biggest complaints that at least our office gets after the election is a voter claiming that they received the wrong ballot style. And so this again is reiterated at every



training, at least the trainings that we provide. I can't speak for the ones that conduct it themselves, but the importance of understanding what those ballot styles are, how important they are to that voter that they're voting on the right representatives and the right districts that they live in, and understanding just how to determine the correct ballot to give to the voter. It's a very simple process. It's not a complicated matter. And so they simply have to pay attention to what is listed on that voter's application to vote.

The campaign-free zone is another area that we focus on. This is more important in some areas of the state than it is in others, but any campaigning inside the campaign-free zone is prohibited on election day. This area includes basically the polling place itself as well as the 100 feet extending to the entrance of the polling place. The judges are trained on what can and cannot be done, what does constitute electioneering, what doesn't constitute electioneering. So anyone coming in with any campaign materials, any sort of hats, any sort of



-- any of that material, the election judges are instructed to make sure that those people leave or remove that, are not electioneering in the polling place.

I was also asked to mention some of the challenges that we encounter. There are lots of challenges, and I think you probably heard about some of them in the last panel. I can echo some of those same challenges. A lot of them -- the fact that we have over 50,000 election judges in the state, you're working with a lot of different personalities. You have a lot of people that are stubborn or that have -- that are very set in their ways. They have been an election judge for 25 years and they don't want to change the way that they're doing it now. So it is very difficult to identify those people and also to help them understand the importance of following election law.

The party appointment system is there for a reason. Unfortunately, a lot of parties do not actively participate in recruiting election judges so that -- you know, we have Democrat judges, Republican judges there for a reason, and most of



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the time the county clerks are the ones out there recruiting those judges. So it's not the actual party system that is recruiting those judges.

They're not actively engaged in it.

Funding. Our funding. All of our equipment is breaking down and we can't afford to buy new equipment. Funding for election judges, you know, some places where they can pay judges well, it's not nearly as hard to recruit judges. However, when you have a very small county where that county bears the burden of paying those election judges and they're only paying them a hundred dollars, you're going to find it hard to convince someone to work a 13-, 14-hour day when you're only paying them a hundred dollars. It's not worth it for them to take a day off work or what have you.

And another final one, and I will wrap this up, a lot of the new mandates that are great for helping voters are very intimidating to election authorities because many of the older generation, it's hard for them to learn something new and to adapt to that and incorporate that into election day.



1

And with that, I will conclude.

2

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you, Mr. Davis.

3

Mr. Orr, you have the microphone. You have

4

12 minutes.

MR. ORR:

5

you're doing this. I think it's a good exercise.

Thank you. I really appreciate that

6 7

I was delighted to hear the panel before me, and

8

I'm going to say one thing on that real quickly.

9

when it comes to suggestions about training of

10

judges and getting new judges, number one, one of

11

the best things we ever did is the Teen Judge

people that know the technology. They're very

12

Program. We have thousands and thousands of young

13

14

good.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If we want to have all these problems go away, we do one simple thing: We make election day a holiday or we have the schools closed. If you are in Chicago, you have a hundred thousand administrators, teachers in the Cook County area and there would be a lot of good judges.

Now I'm going to follow my notes a little bit because as a long-time politician, I don't want to ramble too much. So I have been in this office since 1990. Before that, the City Council for 12



years; as a professor before; and now at the Harris School of Public Policy. I've been involved in voting right issues all that time.

So we're discussing policy, laws, actions in Illinois that create --

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Orr, I'm being told to use the microphone.

MR. ORR: Is that better for those that want to listen?

We're discussing policies that create a dispirit impact on certain communities in our electoral system which affects voting, voter registration, counting the votes, and access to very important information.

I also want to discuss the flip side of this, some of those things that have helped to maximize access to voters throughout the state.

To ensure good government, a strong democracy, we must support rules and laws that serve all populations. Unfortunately, there is a constant battle in our society to pass laws that hurt certain populations. Some are intentional. Some perhaps are not. There are many examples of people making it difficult to go out and vote.



I'll give you a couple quick examples before I get to the heart of what I'm going to talk about. And by the way, these examples come from people in both parties.

Take Cicero, for example. For a long time, Cicero was arresting people trying to register voters. The police were hassling them, where's your permit? You obviously didn't need a permit. It's just kind of one example of things that can happen.

Take something else. The famous 2000 election in which people saw some of the weaknesses of the punch card system. In that election, we discovered that there was a dispirit impact particularly on minority voters, what they call a fall off in the ballot. There was not a large percentage, but more minority folks who didn't vote for president than nonminority. Okay.

So we went about finding a way to solve that. We discovered -- we got error detection equipment, all set to implement it, and a certain famous senator, head of the Republican Senate, I won't mention his name, he blocked it. He said we ain't going to do nothing for Cook County, even



though in Illinois other counties had error protection devices at the time. Now, fortunately, the Court didn't see it that way and we finally got that.

Or take the issue of police. Police in suburban Cook, we do not have police at our polling places unless we need them. But in our local elections, sometimes mayors will try and use police as an intimidation instrument. Again back to Cicero. I love to pick on Cicero. Recently, they hired about 60 or 70 off-duty Chicago cops with guns displayed and they put them in all the polling places without any credentials, and it took us about four or five hours to get them all out of the polling places.

Let me jump now to a much larger
historical issue in Illinois that could have had a
much more profound dispirit impact on certain
communities, and that is Motor Voter. I was proud
to be active in that fight, supporting Motor Voter,
what we call NVRA back in the early '90s. I think
most of us now know, it was and is a much easier
way for the vast majority of people to register to
vote. It was cheaper than existing methods and



safer because people were coming to register right in front of government officials, not at a deputy registrar that may or may not be legit.

So that law was passed. The Illinois governor at that time, Edgar, refused to obey the federal law. So the federal courts had to step in and force him to which meant a lot of money spent and several months of delay, but the courts ordered him to do that. But the Governor refused and attempted to get around the federal court order by using a "two-tier system" that made voting separate. In other words, if you used the Motor Voter, that would qualify you for voting for federal law, federal elections, but you'll have to register a second time for state and local elections.

Well, obviously, we thought that was terrible, and myself and others, along with the League of Women Voters, went to court and again won in court. So the Governor was forced to implement the law as was intended and, today, millions each year get registered this way.

On the brighter side, Illinois has been a leader in ensuring greater access to voter



registration and voting. Let me just give a quick example. I'm not going to talk about them but things that I really believe have helped on things we don't talk about. Of course, early voting which, remember, I introduced that in Illinois for one simple reason: We vote on a workday; only two major nations in the world that vote on a workday. So early voting. I believe it's worked. Voting by mail for everyone. On-line voter registration. Big, big success. On-line mail ballot applications. Since everyone can vote by mail now, now they can get their application on line. And the Teen Judge Program for the reasons I mentioned before.

But, again, even good actions can be misused. Take one example. Take early voting.

Most of us I think would agree it's a good thing, but when a county here in Illinois a few years back refused to put in an early voting site in one of the largest cities in the county that happened to be mostly African-American -- there was no rule in that, in state law -- the legislature stepped in and passed a law requiring that that particular clerk had to do that.



There's other cases like that where, unfortunately, partisan advantage gets in the way of implementing what is otherwise a good law.

Now let me turn to the main thing that I wanted to talk about today, and that is a few years go, to try and really make a dent in voter registration, to really improve the way we keep the records, calling something a voter registration renaissance, this thing called All In that's up on the screen. It's premised upon three key points.

So the first prong is using government transactions to register eligible voters and update their addresses. We all know that's terribly important. Almost everyone regularly gives the government their address, personal information for their ID or license plate, receive a benefit or to pay taxes.

The second prong is through requiring state agencies to share data with each other with election officials and with other states in order to eliminate outdated registrations.

And, finally, what I call the third prong is by offering election day registration as a backstop for those eligible voters that we don't



capture in points one and two.

We're making a lot of progress, fortunately, with the State Board of Elections and others, but we're still not quite there yet.

Now it sounds completely fair and neutral, for example, to have one registration rule that says, you have to re-register when you vote --excuse me, when you move. But let me -- let's say the rule was a little different, okay. Wealthy people must register every eight years, okay; middle class, every four years; poor, every two years; and 18- to 24-year-olds, every year. I don't think you think that's fair. But it shows that the same rule can have a dispirit impact on our populations, and that's the heart of what we have to talk about here.

Our duty as government officials and policymakers is to understand the purpose of these rules, in this case, accurate voter registration records, and see if we can get that as simple as possible and has a smallest dispirit impact on our population. Therefore, two years ago, we began the big push along with the wonderful groups that you heard before for AVR, automatic voter registration.



This was to be the fulfillment of the first prong.

We know that AVR would dramatically clean the list. Voters would not have to worry about re-registering every time they moved. The current system is inefficient and inconvenient. AVR would get us closer to the point where voters would know that registration was current and administrators would have more accurate voting registration information.

If anyone doubts how important the current registration -- that there is dispirit impact, look at the following numbers. We live in a mobile society. In 2015, more than 13 percent of Illinoisans, nearly 1.7 million people, moved. Okay. Jumping down to income, for example, if you're below the 100 percent poverty line, you're more than twice as likely to move. By race, African-Americans move 43 -- no, they move twice as often as whites. I could go on with other numbers. It's up on here.

The bottom line is whether it's minorities, poor people, renters, there is a very significant difference in their mobility. That means a so-called fair system we have today makes



it much harder for them; therefore, dispirit impact. We can solve all that with AVR.

It did pass the legislature with the Republicans votes as well up on the board; but, unfortunately, the Governor vetoed the bill. It is being reintroduced, and we hope that working with both parties we can actually pass that.

The second prong is data sharing. Sharing date is critical. We're now members of ERIC which is very important because ERIC compares voter information across state lines by looking at driver's license data, SSI, change of address. This is so important. Here's where we get tons of information.

For example, from the data we now know about, last August, we knew 34,000 people deceased just in Cook County alone. Okay. 34,000, I think that's statewide actually. The problem is, as Cook County Clerk, I know when people die in Cook County, but some people have the nerve to die in other counties and other states and don't tell us. So there's thousands of people.

More than 60,000 below that move within the county, move within the state. 90,000 people



register twice. With frankly a snap of our fingers, we can correct all that. So it's all within our reach if we could just move ahead. These numbers are great because we get all this information from other states.

The third prong is basically EDR, election day registration. We've talked about it. It worked very well. More than a hundred thousand people who had been turned away from the polls. And it was fairly seamless. In suburban Cook County, we had no problems with election day registration.

Just a word quickly on languages. We have something up there, very quickly. I'm jumping ahead because we're about out of time. But working with again the various communities, we have a lot of things we do in various communities, going beyond what the law requires. If you have questions, we can talk about that.

And in the last second or so that I've got, there's a lot of things that we're doing which are good to make voting more accessible, registration a little easier; but I do want to mention, even though we're not discussing it today,



if we don't deal with money and politics and the
rise of voter suppression in this country, our
fragile democracy will be gone. In my mind, it is
that serious.

I thank you for the time. I do believe there's a lot of good stuff we can do.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much, Mr. Orr.

Ms. Ehler, the microphone is yours. You have 12 minutes.

MS. EHLER: Thank you so much and thank you to the panel for having us here today. On behalf of Attorney General Lisa Madigan, I would like to thank the Illinois Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for convening this public meeting on this critical topic.

Voting rights are an essential civil right. I am Chief of the Civil Rights Bureau for the Office of the Illinois Attorney General; and, in that capacity, I am not the sole person involved in voting rights issues in our office. What you should know is that our entire office is involved in election mongering and voting rights. It is a bedrock of our state, of our democracy that individuals have access to the polls and access to



the ballot.

I am pleased to be sitting here on a panel alongside so many terrific public servants. It's an honor. And I just want to give a brief overview of what our office does so you understand our intersection here with this critical issue.

The Illinois Attorney General is the chief legal officer for the State of Illinois. In that role, we represent and defend state agencies in civil litigation and before the United States Supreme Court. We represent the people of the State of Illinois which means we have the authority and responsibility to represent the public interest.

Our office has over 400 lawyers making it the largest public interest law firm in the State of Illinois. In just 2016 alone, our office collected nearly a billion dollars in revenue for the State of Illinois through litigation and collection efforts.

The Attorney General's office performs a variety of work including civil litigation, appellate litigation, and, on occasion, criminal law enforcement; but the dominant portion of our



work is civil litigation. We work on consumer rights, antitrust suits, public utility matters, crime victims, environmental crimes, and relevant for today's discussion, civil rights.

Now our Civil Rights Bureau's mission is to protect the civil rights of all Illinois residents, including all rights existing under federal constitutional, state constitutional, statutory, administrative, and common law. We review and respond to constituent complaints involving civil rights issues and conduct investigations of discrimination in housing, public accommodations, employment, and financial matters; and, when necessary, we will litigate where a pattern and practice of discrimination is discovered, including voting rights.

The Bureau also monitors and advocates for legislation to strengthen current state and federal civil rights laws. For example, the Attorney General recently announced legislation to strengthen Illinois' statutes on hate crimes. That provides the Attorney General with enforcement authority to take action on behalf of the people of Illinois and ensures that all victims have the



ability to file a civil action for intimidation, stalking, and cyberstalking which are new realms of the hate crime territory.

Our Bureau also participates in community outreach programs across the state to educate individuals about their rights and their protection.

But as I discussed earlier, voting rights are as essential to civil rights -- are an essential part of civil rights as well which is why the Illinois Attorney General's office does so much to ensure those rights.

Each general election, the Attorney

General's office believes that the ability to

engage in the Democratic process is an essential

civil right that needs protection. So our office

protects that right in a variety of ways. In every

statewide election, in some local municipal

elections as well, we send out teams of attorneys

and investigators throughout the State of Illinois.

We fan out to all precincts across the state to

monitor voting locations.

Under the Illinois Election Code, the Attorney General of Illinois is permitted to enter



and observe polling places to ensure that individuals have the ability to cast a vote. The goal of these monitors' work is to ensure the voting process is a fair, open, and legal election and that all voters' rights are protected.

Monitors visit voting locations throughout each election day to ensure local election officials are properly verifying voters' identities and properly allowing individuals to vote without a driver's license.

what we often find when we go and monitor polling places is that sometimes election judges will say, well, it's just faster if you give me your driver's license; and we always have to remind them that just because it's faster doesn't mean that you have to ask for it or require it and you may, in fact, be intimidating others who come in, see a long line and everyone else holding out their driver's licenses. So don't ask for it and don't require it and don't give the impression that it is required.

Our teams also make sure that ballots are being properly collected and that electronic machines are working properly so that individuals



who want to use them are able.

Another goal that our teams have is to ensure polling locations are accessible to voters with disabilities by making sure that all entrances are accessible.

Finally, attorneys monitoring polling locations can report any allegations of voters being denied access to vote to the Attorney General's office. We maintain voter hot lines throughout the day, and we triage the complaints that come in. Sometimes we connect with the Cook County Clerk. Sometimes we connect with the State Board of Elections. We work very closely with the folks at the table and their offices and staff to make sure that each election goes as smoothly as possible.

In extreme cases, the Attorney General has asked the Court to intervene where it appears that individuals were denied the right to vote because of long lines or system malfunctions. For example, in 2014, the Attorney General filed an emergency injunction to keep certain polling locations open past 8 p.m. in Lake County when we learned that certain same day registration voting locations had



not opened as scheduled at 6 a.m.

When violations of the Election Code do occur, the Attorney General may request that the State's Attorney initiate proceedings to enforce any provision of the Election Code or to initiate a criminal prosecution with respect to a violation of the Election Code. And if the State's Attorney declines or does not act within 60 days, then the Attorney General can take the prosecution independently of the State's Attorney's office.

Our office also ensures that measures such as same day voter registration are effective and available to voters in Illinois. In 2014, as David Orr laid out, the Illinois legislature passed a law that allowed voters to register to vote on the same day as the election. Just before the presidential election in 2016, a lawsuit was filed to prevent it from going into effect. As defenders of the state law, we sought an emergency injunction from the federal 7th Circuit Court of Appeals to allow the law to go into effect and restore Illinois voters' legal rights to register to vote and cast their ballot at the same time in the last general election.



1 We also try to ensure that voters know their rights. While enforcement efforts are key to 2 3 ensuring that our elections are fair and balanced, 4 it is just as important that individuals understand 5 their rights so they can know when they are being violated. Each election, we remind voters and 6 local officials of these basic voting rights. 7 8 Voters have the same right to register to vote and cast their vote at the same time. You do not need 9 10 to show identification to cast your vote so long as 11 your voter registration is active and you are in the correct precinct. The only time you're 12 13 required to show registration is if your voter 14 registration has lapsed and entered "inactive status"; and if the voter makes a mistake or spoils 15 16 a paper ballot and the voter has not cast the 17 ballot, the voter has the right to receive a 18 replacement ballot.

No one is allowed to try to influence a voter within 100 feet of the polling place. If the voter cannot read, has trouble understanding English or has a disability, that voter has the right to request assistance from anyone other than his or her employer, an agent of his or her



19

20

21

22

23

employer or an officer or agent of his or her union.

I want to reiterate that the Attorney

General's office and the Civil Rights Bureau is
here as an available resource; and, like I said, we
work closely with the folks at our table and many
of the individuals who have been here today to
ensure that each election is fair and that the
access to the polls is open.

what I would encourage people to do is make sure you think of the Attorney General's Office as a place where you can air certain grievances. You can file complaints with our office; and, again, we will triage those with the appropriate stakeholders or investigate them ourselves.

As I hope you've seen today and heard from my fellow members on the panel, our office is only one piece of this puzzle. And the recent accusations and actions by policymakers regarding the right to vote have shown the importance of all of us working in our official and unofficial capacities to ensure equal rights for all, including the use of the ballot box. Thank you.



CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you so much. And now we will open it up to questions from the Committee. Each Committee member will have one question plus a follow-up as mentioned before. So does anyone want to start the questions?

MS. BOHDZIEWICZ-BOROWIEC: I'm curious. This is a question to Mr. Davis. Is there any way to unify these -- you know, you said you train election judges in 110 jurisdictions and all that, that they're different. Is there a way to unify these regulations?

MR. DAVIS: In a short answer, I would say no just because of the way that Illinois elections are set up with the -- each election authority having more or less control over that jurisdiction and they have control over what kind of training program they're going to provide.

There are some statutory requirements that they do have to follow, but there is still a lot of discretion as far as what they do or don't do.

In addition to us providing training, we do offer to consult with jurisdictions if they want to provide their own training but want to review what we provide. We do offer that as well. And



we're looking into additional options in the future for providing like an on-line training or stuff of that where it would be more available to some citizens or some election judges who find it hard to attend an actual training session, you know.

Some jurisdictions may only have it one time. I conducted one on Tuesday in southern Illinois, one session for the county, but in that county, there was only like 20 election judges that showed up just because of how small it was.

But it would take legislation I believe to sort of unify that or stream line it across the state.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Other questions?
Ms. Wortham?

MS. WORTHAM: Along the same lines, I don't understand the party appointment system. I live in Normal, Illinois, and I went to my polling place, and there's these nice ladies, and I wanted to be one of them. And so I asked, how do I go about joining you? They had forms that were right there for judges. Then it said you had to identify your party. I had begun writing my name and I saw that and I didn't want to do that. So they're not going



to get my participation at that level of civic engagement.

Could you -- I don't want you to educate me fully and take up a lot of time, but tell me where I can find out the history of this and why is it necessary? What's the rationale for it?

MR. DAVIS: Sure. I can give you the short version of it. The basic -- the premise behind the election judges being appointed by the two political parties is so that we have a balance in each polling place. And so if you have at least two or three judges of each party, then obviously they are there to represent their party's interest and if somebody else is, you know, conducting something illegally or inappropriately. And so that is the requirement.

The political parties, the local county chairman is supposed to provide a list of election judges for each precinct that basically they have recruited to the county clerk, but that most often doesn't actually happen and you have the county clerks themselves actively trying to recruit election judges which is why you saw forms in the polling place where they're trying to recruit



election judges.

MS. WORTHAM: But we only have two parties.

MR. DAVIS: The way it is in the state law, it is the two leading political parties that are the ones who appoint election judges.

MR. ORR: In other words, we're not going to be successful in changing that law. The two parties want to control. We worked with the League of Women voters a while back to try and allow one judge to come from a nonpolitical background.

But we can solve your problem. Almost all the clerks will solve your problem. If we need 10,000 judges, only 2500 are going to come from the committeemen, okay, because a lot of them don't know who to get. It's different than it used to be. So most of the county clerks will go around looking for people and they're looking for -- so it can be -- there's lot of League of Women Voters, people that serve as judges, but people do have to, by law, declare a party, and sometimes that causes confusion. Sometimes people say I don't care, and we'll say, well, we need a Republican, I don't care, I'll be a Republican, okay.

The only people that really care is if the



parties believe those people are pretending to be that same party and trying to do harm with it. But generally that's not a problem. In a place like suburban Cook where we can't find enough Democrats up in Barrington, if we have an extra Republican, they do fine. In Thornton, they can't get enough Republicans, we use an extra Democrat.

But there's ways to serve your purposes because most clerks will be able to find a way for people who are not necessarily picked by committeemen to be an election judge and we need them.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Any other questions?

MS. BUYS: So you mentioned barriers to being election judges, and one of them is the idea that they have to be there all day long. Is that a requirement that they be there all day long? And why does that need to be a requirement? Why can't you have them in shifts?

MR. ORR: Well, there's nothing in the law that I believe would deny the shifts. The problem -- think, at least on our part, the administration. If I had a small county, as most of our counties are with maybe 20,000 voters, I probably would do



that. I would say, if these two are willing, okay,
fine, share the day, we'll train both of them.

I don't want to be responsible for all that -- it's hard for us to deal with 20,000 judges, okay. So I don't want to deal with 40,000.

But other places around the country are trying to do that, and, of course, the more sane thing to do would be to make the day shorter, both on Saturday and Sunday, and then you got shorter hours.

That is the biggest single impediment to good judges who want to do the job. The day is too long. So we can't do that because of our size; but I have said to people, you want to split it, but only she gets the check, you got to split it. So for other smaller counties, they might be able to do that right now.

MR. DAVIS: There is a provision in the Election Code -- I don't know if this is working or not. The Election Code does have a specific provision that says that the election judge cannot adjourn before the polling place is -- I don't remember the terminology it uses, but basically they can't leave before the election day is



complete, done, and they're finished with all of 1 2 their duties. So it would take a legislative change for 3 that, but there are obviously lots of --4 5 MR. ORR: A lot of things we don't pay 6 attention to. 7 MR. DAVIS: -- lots of complications that could 8 potentially arise from people coming and going 9 throughout the day. And people that sign in in the 10 morning as election judges, we want a complete 11 record of everything that has happened throughout 12 the day, and that also helps with accountability to 13 have the same people there throughout the day or, at least, that would be my thinking on it. 14 15 CHAIRMAN LINARES: You want to follow up? So I was going to ask a follow-up 16 MS. BUYS: 17 question. With technology and on-line voting, do you see the need to have fewer election judges in 18 19 the future if people could do it all on line? 20 MR. ORR: On line meaning? 21 I mean, would you be able to vote on MS. BUYS: 22 line as well? 23 Well, if you mean like voting from MR. ORR:



24

your home computer, I think that's a long way off.

And with recent things, not to mention Russia, et cetera, I think it's even further away off. We haven't cracked the security thing issue.

It's important to remember this. People say, well, the banks, I got hundreds of thousands of dollars. Well, but the thing about the banks, they screw up or someone steals your stuff, the bank gives you the money back. With elections, it's one day. You screw up the one day, you can't do it again. You can't make it up.

So I don't think that's -- and there's some places in the world where they're trying it. It's a long way off. But there's other things like that that we're doing. For example, we're saving money by having fewer precincts because now we are reaching a point where maybe 30 to 35 percent of eligible voters, because of mail voting and early voting, are voting before election day.

That also means the election goes

further -- the equipment goes further, okay, with
how many touch screens you might have, et cetera.

So it's working in the right direction. And I
wouldn't be surprised in few years that you have a
lot fewer polling places as more people vote



earlier.

So on line we can use for registering, getting your mail ballot, but because of security issues, I don't think that's -- you know, maybe ten years from now.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Cobb has a question.

MR. COBB: Good afternoon. So throughout the day, we've heard pretty much on every panel some complaints about the lack of uniformity throughout the counties in pretty much every aspect of voting from the machines themselves to access specifically for folks who are in pretrial detention, so really any way that you can cut it or dice it.

And I think you were all present during the last panel when the League of Women Voters where said, at least five times, the lack of uniformity is a huge problem.

So having heard that, how would you respond to that? Do you all view that as a huge problem that has a potential impact in the civil rights of the voters in Illinois or do you disagree with that position?

MS. EHLER: I haven't spoken. I'll give it a try. I do think it's a problem. I don't know how



-- so there's a lack of uniformity in terms of training judges, right, which Mr. Davis has already explored. That is a piece that as technology and webinars and other modules are available, maybe there are ways to address that, a more uniform system and/or for additional training. You know, if you have a volunteer judge or a judge who, you know, is first coming to doing -- working with this sort of technology for the first time, one day of training for a real, you know, critical event of running an election, maybe that individual needs a bit more homework, right, or needs to give it another go around with the information. webinars and other technology platforms might be useful for that purpose, right, to encourage consistency across the state.

So I wasn't here for all the panel discussions today, but in terms of the civil rights issues, you know, we do see some of those coming to a pressure point, and I think they are worthy of continued discussion and thinking through what we can do to address them. I don't know if I have the answers today, but I think it's absolutely something we should continue to look at.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. ORR: Quickly, I'm concerned about the uniformity, but I don't want to overdo it partly

because certain things you can't solve.

One, just quickly on the training.

Remember, there's lots more coordination than I
think people understand. I think it would be a
mistake to try and have one person train everybody,
okay. But as you mention, we share information.
The county clerks meet. They talk to each other.
There are certain -- you have to teach the same
thing. You got to teach -- it's not like, oh, we
teach something different. So people do teach the
same thing. Some have fewer resources, which is

always a problem; but, remember, nowadays, there's

all sorts of new tools that are very important.

So training is no longer that one or two or three days. Training means to deal with the problem of people maybe getting the wrong ballot is every place where there's more than one ballot style in a precinct. We e-mail all those judges. The rest of them don't have to pay attention. But those 300 precincts will get an e-mail a week before the election, the night before the election

reminding, you have three ballot styles in your



precinct, don't forget.

So nowadays with e-mail and all sorts of other social media, we can do things that we could never do before.

As the rest of it, be careful about the uniformity because, you know, uniformity means then that you got a legislature -- no offense, I appreciate the things that we've introduced that they've passed -- but then you kind of get the big clumsy whatever in the room, and a lot of times we have problems with our election law because, you know, it's always not neat. I could give you a lot of examples, but we don't have time.

So I'm not that worried about uniformity except for things -- the principal, I mentioned about early voting sites. I'm more concerned about uniformity nationally than within the state.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Kazmi has a question.

MR. KAZMI: Yes, two questions. The first will be for Mr. Davis and Ms. Ehler and then real quickly for Clerk Orr.

Question one, what is the purpose of two forms of IDs? So you two answer that. And then for the Clerk, I want to hear your perspective of



-- we've heard it from three different panels today how there are 110 different jurisdictions, but we have 102 counties, and in a lot of other states, there's only one county -- there's one, I guess, election official or organization for the whole county rather than a city. So if you guys could answer that.

MR. DAVIS: As far as the ID requirements, the two forms of ID, that's only for registration. As far as the rationale behind it, I can't really speak to why it was put in Illinois law. It's been there for as long as I've been with the Board which has been since 2005.

But to establish a residence where that person is entitled to vote, that specific residence is, you know, determining what all the different districts and all the different taxing bodies that they are voting on representatives for.

So I guess it's just to establish, you know, a safeguard to make sure they are voting in the proper districts and they're not trying to vote somewhere elsewhere where they wouldn't have the same interest as someone who lives in those districts.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I don't know if that answers your question. I don't really know that I'm qualified to -- do you have --

I agree with Mr. Davis that it's MS. EHLER: really to verify residence in that district, in that specific district. But I think that, you know, having affidavits and other bases to be able to present verification on that is always useful and important because you don't want it to be a barrier.

The reason I ask that is because it MR. KAZMT: can seem to be a barrier. And so in other states, the way it's set up is you could have different ways of satisfying your two forms of identification, so you may have three documents, but it decreases the barrier of someone having the ability to have a state- or government-issued identification. And so I was wondering if that was why, you know, when you register, you get these two that you need to have.

MR. DAVIS: Can I respond? The ID requirements, the two forms, they are pretty loose requirements. You don't have to have a state ID. You don't have to have -- if you have a piece of



mail that you've received, you know, a telephone bill or a government document, that will serve as identification, and only one of the two forms of ID has to have your current address. So you're establishing who you are, and with one of those pieces, you are establishing that you are at that address, an Illinois resident.

MR. ORR: Just one point. I think the most important thing was just said by my colleagues here is the address. That's what's really important here in the future if you want to deal with potential fraud or a clean list.

And so I think frankly it's kind of a compromise. It's not too much. Most people have to. People get robbed and have a problem, but we find ways to deal with that. We do. We give them a birth record and they can start the process over again.

In terms of consolidation, again, the point is that we have 102 counties, but we have a few jurisdictions where for other reasons -- like Chicago and Cook County, maybe because they're big jurisdictions, I can't tell you exactly why. So Chicago has a separate Board of Elections and Cook



County, I handle the suburban part of Cook County.

My general view is consolidation is smart everywhere, you know, wherever we can combine things because, number one, like, let's say, you know, you're sitting at home and you're so excited because you think your state rep just won, but you're only looking at the suburban part, and when you bring in the city, your state rep lost. So there's a lot of things that would make it easier for voters. They're confused why if they move one block from Chicago to Cook to suburban, they got to change registration.

So, generally, I do think the government, in general, needs to consolidate wherever they can. And there's rules to do that, but, of course, there's so many that are controversial because, unfortunately, the bottom line for most of us is political control, what party or what individuals control that operation. That's why even though I don't like election officials to be partisan, Republican or Democrat, electing people frankly in my view is a lot better than having powerful hidden interest controlling them.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: I'm going to make the



Chair's prerogative and ask a question. This is for Mr. Orr or for anyone on the panel.

Mr. Orr, you started with the concept of making the voting day a holiday. I just wanted to make my notes clear here on this. And you mentioned I think a couple things. A hundred thousand more people or households, but you also mentioned that we're one of only two nations that don't do that. And then you concluded at some point talking about that this is a national issue. Can you elaborate a little bit on this topic?

MR. ORR: Again, almost everybody else in the world votes on a Sunday or a holiday. Just by design. And so we've come a long way because it makes it much harder -- talking about dispirit impact -- it's much harder for poor and others to get away or the transportation issues.

The difficulty is, you know, we got federal and state. If I had to do it, you know, I would do another holiday. Everybody would have a big -- except my employees would be upset about that, but, you know, we have Veterans Day. You know, what better use of Veterans Day but the day we vote?



The difficulty is, of course, statute and law that, you know, we vote on the second Tuesday -- or the first Tuesday in November. You know all the past history. We had to get the harvest in and people needed time to take the buggy and the horse to travel from Sunday to Tuesday to vote.

We could change that. It would take a really super effort. And not everybody wants more people to vote. I hate to say it. And, again, it's not just Republicans or Democrats, but that's a big factor in what happens.

So we'd be better off, like I say, we start easy. We could certainly do it in Illinois. There are many schools that are closed. There's jurisdictions that are closed; but if, in fact, we had all schools closed, you would have that great advantage of having at least the teachers. A holiday would be great, but I don't think we can create a new one. We would have to use an existing one. And whether or not the veterans would wipe me out, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Thank you. Ms. Wortham, you had a question.

MS. WORTHAM: Yes. I wanted to get your help



again. Consider this. Someone says that we need the voter ID in order to prevent voter fraud, and someone else says there has been no voter fraud, therefore, we do not need voter ID.

Is there a rationale for voter ID that one can make that is detached from criminalizing the practice -- the voter criminalizing their voting?

MR. ORR: I'll start. Again, in a world where people are not trying to hurt each other, and like most of us, we do have voter ID, but it is -- where people have them a long time, they're free if you get them replaced, okay. There is no particular need according to all the studies that have been done because of voter fraud particularly impersonating someone.

Now, again, I'm worried about fraud.

People do try and cheat. It's still very rare if you compare it with the hundreds of millions of people that vote.

My problem with the voter ID, if you look particularly in the last 20 years, when voter IDs are used surgically for a political purpose, okay. So when Texas did its voter ID, their goal clearly was to disenfranchise people. In their brief, they

admitted, despite all the powerful attorneys, they could find not one case of prosecution for voter ID fraud. But they admitted it in their own brief that 600,000 Latinos would be knocked off the rolls because they had the wrong ID.

So what I'm suggesting, if you look at the motives -- for example, the state of Texas said we are not going to let all the students in Texas who have a Department of Education ID provided by the State Department of Education, that's no longer good. They have to get a new one. That suggests the motives of the ID are not for fraud. They're to depress the vote. I don't think there's any question about that.

So the issue is if you're legitimately concerned about fraud, and we all should be, is what measures we can take, okay, as opposed to the ID requirement which I say almost no one has found examples of people impersonating others, but it could happen.

- MS. WORTHAM: Could I just?
- CHAIRMAN LINARES: A follow-up, yes.
- MS. WORTHAM: Then am I to conclude all other things being equal there is no practical use,



1 utility for voter ID? It's more or less --2 It's enormously practical. MR. ORR: MS. WORTHAM: Well, that's what I'm looking 3 4 for. It helps your side to win. Just look 5 MR. ORR: 6 at these states. 7 MS. WORTHAM: No, I don't mean partisan. IS there a need to identify oneself as this person and 8 9 no one else in the voting process? MR. ORR: We believe, at least in Illinois, we 10 11 do that by our registration process. Okay? And beside what they said earlier, talking about IDs, 12 13 we've gone way beyond that now. We have all this 14 data. We can track people. 15 So the key is, yes, you want to know that it's really Brent Davis that is voting, and there 16 17 are people sometimes that try and cheat. 18 I don't want to take too much MS. WORTHAM: time. You're helping me out. I just need to get 19 20 an objective, clean rationale without any motives 21 by any human being for this -- the rationale for 22 the ID, why is it necessary? I'm not 23 questioning --24 CHAIRMAN LINARES: And then we'll have to move



 $1 \mid \mathsf{on}$.

MR. ORR: We can give it to you, but I don't agree with it. Simply the rationale is, to fight voter fraud, we need to have photo ID at the polling place --

MS. WORTHAM: I'll talk to you.

MR. ORR: -- which I think is wrong.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Rodriguez had a question and then Ms. Haleem.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Mr. Orr, you mentioned toward the end of your testimony or you alluded to money in voter influencing. You said our current campaign finance rules drown out the opinion of someone increasing the influence of others so the role of money as it relates to access to voting, voter suppression.

Earlier in the first panel, there was a conversation around redistricting and the impact that redistricting has in access to voting, just voting in general. So I was wondering if you were alluding to that or you can expand on your comment relating to campaign finance.

MR. ORR: I wasn't alluding to redistricting, but that's a major problem. Again, remember, we



have to honest. We can't smooth it all over. You can have states that have a particular party where they have votes but they do not have legislators, and when you have that, something smells, you got redistricting.

My point on the money -- you know, the things we're talking about, the dispirit impact, okay, that pales in significance. Just think of the money we're talking about, okay, when billionaires can spend as much as they want and the Court basically says that is free speech.

Remember, it's not just that. It's just not that some people may be elected that normally wouldn't. It goes beyond that.

Now we have powerful folks, and I'll pick on both the Mayor and the Governor, who raise tens of millions of dollars on the side that basically say, you, legislator, do what I want or I will crush you. Very simple. And they do.

That's why our AVR did not -- they had a lot of Republican support, but they wouldn't go up against the Governor when it came to overriding the veto. That's their choice.

It goes further than that. When you take



the money, what happens? You have campaigns now —
it used to be a campaign which would start in
September. You have campaigns, the last
presidential campaign went for 14 months. You're
talking about hundreds of millions of dollars that
goes for 14 months. Who can run that? Okay. And
what is all that money spent for? Some of the
worst ads in the world that has an enormous effect
on turning people off. Okay.

So everything we're doing is unfortunately different than the rest of the world, although, unfortunately, some of the world is beginning to monitor us. So when you don't have the limits -- you know, when March comes, the negative ads start the day after March instead of what used to be September.

So when you think about all those impacts, that does have a dispirit impact because not everybody has a hundred million dollars. And just the Republican alone with more than a hundred million that they spent I believe in 2014, of that hundred some million, over half of it came from three billionaires. Your governor, Mr. Ken Griffin and I can't pronounce his name, Mr. Eulert. No



offense. I wish I had the money, too. But that is an enormous impact, and it also shapes the public policy, and when the public policy doesn't follow elections, what people vote for, that's why people give up and so forth.

I can't overestimate -- if we had time, though, there's a lot of good things going on in the country to try and counteract that which we should think about here in Illinois like Seattle. Every citizen gets four \$25 coupons, okay, to give to their favorite candidates as a way of trying to equalize.

So I got nothing against a millionaire, but I would like to see good people up there if you're a good candidate but you can't afford to get in. So we balance off the super wealthy with lots of smaller contributions. There's a lot of good stuff out there.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Ms. Haleem?

MS. HALEEM: So we heard a lot today about barriers to voting or just some of the barriers are complicated, it's going to take time to overcome. And some things seem to be really low-hanging fruit, like either election judges are misinformed



or don't want to learn new things or whatever.

So why not -- just like when you are at the airport and the TSA has a sign, number one, shoes, number two, this, number three. So at polling places that you don't need to show your ID, if you need help, you know, you can get somebody or whatever. So those types of things that trumps any personal misinterpretations from the election judges. Is that -- would that be possible?

MS. EHLER: That is currently happening in some locations. I've monitored both Cook County and DuPage County elections over the last two years, and there are similar signs. Most of them are only in English. I will say that. But I think there are trends in that direction.

MR. ORR: There's a lot of stuff. We have Bill of Rights. We do a lot of things like that. The challenge when we're dealing with a number of people, as Brent said, is you have got people that are just old-fashioned. And sometimes we will bring in people that talk about how you deal with those with disabilities or certain language minorities. You know, let's face it, a lot of people speak English.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So we have to educate our judges, but, remember, we don't have total control over them when we only have a few hours to train them. what we try and do is bring in groups who represent these various issues and have them talk with judges, too, but we have limited time.

So we're trying to do that, and I think at least -- I think our judge training in suburban Cook is really good now. We're getting increasingly lots of good people, but with as many we have, we get some that are not so good.

MS. HALEEM: The signs would just be like neutral so it's not left up to the judges to --

MS. EHLER: Yes.

MS. HALEEM: This would be for everyone, too.

Very practically, there's so many MR. ORR: signs that we have to put up, okay, that part of the judgment here is how do we do it? You have this sign, this sign, this sign. But the point is a really good one. The more we can educate our people to point, to look at those key things, okay, to really be sensitive particularly when you're dealing with both the language accessibility and particularly folks with disabilities.

12

13

14

1516

18

19

17

2021

22

24

23

MR. DAVIS: Just to kind of echo what Mr. Orr said, there are a lot of signs already in the polling place and to make us, you know, have more I think is not a bad idea; but in order to have it in every polling place, it takes legislation to require it. I mean, there is legislation that requires voter instructions to be in there, sample ballots to be posted, all of those sorts of things; and, again, this uniformity just takes a state law basically.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Mr. Howard, you got a question?

MR. HOWARD: For Mr. Orr, you stress the problem of voter suppression and, to me, that implies an actor, a suppressor. So I'm a little hazy. Are there bad actors that are suppressing the vote? And who might they be? Or is it the result of legislation, ID requirements, inadequate procedures? How do you see the suppression notion?

MR. ORR: Well, since there's so much, I would focus on the intentional suppression, okay, that often leads to the laws you mentioned.

We all talked about voter ID. I'll give you a very blatant one, okay. If one wants to

study, and this is not Illinois, okay, and this is Democrats, okay. If one wants to study the south, okay, and particularly how they deal with felons, okay, you can read the language. Senator so-and-so in 1898 said, now, listen, here's what we're going to do, he said it publicly, okay, we're going to have all these laws, it's a felony to spit on the sidewalk, we're going to arrest every black person we have and give them a felony, they're never going to vote again. That is what they said and that is what they did.

And you still have hundreds of thousands of people, okay. The election in Florida would never have been close in 2000. If you look at all the people who we denied the right to vote because they're permanent felons for spitting on the sidewalk. That is one of the felonies.

And you see what's going on in Virginia,
North Carolina, Florida, and Texas. Those are what
I call intentional voter suppression.

Now the good ol' Chicago machine was very good at intentional voter suppression. The voter ID is one, or when the woman in Milwaukee bragged that we have to cut down early voting because too



many minorities are voting early.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There is a serious move -- and not everybody. I'm not condemning everyone, but people understand -- those people understand that voting is power and they want to win. And I guess we have to be very aware of it. They may be good people. There's going to be good people that certainly believe in the photo ID. I'm not going to condemn them. But if you look, like I said before, at particular motivations, if it's a photo ID that four years from now, everybody's got it and if you lose it, we're going to replace it, that's a totally different concept than what Pennsylvania did with six months before election, 800,000 people will be disenfranchised, and they didn't even have a system set up to allow those people to get new Or Texas, where they have 60 county seats IDS. where they don't even give out IDs because Texas is so big.

So my point there is where there's intentional, and if you look at some of the language, that sometimes people are not as coy as they should be. Now there's other things that could be unintentional.



But those things are on the rise in this country, particularly, like I said, as soon as the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act within weeks, hundreds of pieces of legislation were entered all through those states that before had to have preclearance. So it's a very serious problem and it's happening in lots of places.

MR. HOWARD: Thank you.

MR. ORR: As a politician, I can say all these things. I'm not sure my colleagues can.

CHAIRMAN LINARES: Other questions? None heard. Before we dismiss our panelists, I want to remind everyone, we have open -- public comment coming right after this.

So with that, Ms. Ehler, Mr. Orr,
Ms. Davis, thank you for your testimony. Thank you
for coming out. Your session is closed. Thank
you.

And I'm going to ask the staff here if we have members of the public who have signed up for public comment. If so, how many so we can time them? And we know we have a few of our committee members that have to leave.

We do have one member, Brian Gladstein, if



you want to approach the table. So the public 1 2 comment period is open till 5 p.m. I won't say you 3 have all 45 minutes, but we'll allot you, 4 Mr. Gladstein --5 Just me? MR. GLADSTEIN: 6 CHAIRMAN LINARES: Yeah, it is just you. 7 I get an hour? MR. GLADSTEIN: 8 CHAIRMAN LINARES: No, you don't. But you if 9

you want to take ten minutes, go for it, and thank you for coming. Give your name, your organization.

Brian Gladstein. I'm the MR. GLADSTEIN: Executive Director of Common Cause Illinois. you for having this today. I'll be short. I don't even know if I'll use ten minutes. My colleagues I know throughout the day have been -- I've gotten texts and I have gotten posts about some of the same things that I want to talk about.

But just for people who don't know about Common Cause, we are an organization that was started in 1970. We have approximately 700,000 members across the country in 35 states including Illinois where we have now 27,000 members. actually had 13,000 a year ago. So Common Cause Illinois re-established itself four years ago.



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 | 2 | Ill | 3 | we | 4 | pol | 5 | Ill | 6 | and | 7 | And | 8 |

We work on two major priority issues in Illinois. Naturally we work on redistricting and we work on money and politics -- I mean, media and politics and a variety of other issues; but here in Illinois it's been voting rights over the last four and a half years and it's been money and politics. And so David just talked a little bit about money and politics so I can actually address that as well. That might be something a little bit unique than what you've heard so far today.

We've been one of the founding groups to create the Just Democracy Coalition that you probably heard throughout the day where we were able to help with on-line voter registration get over the finish line and for passing same day registration. And now we're working on automatic voter registration to get over a million people automatically registered. Common Cause was instrumental in getting it passed in Oregon as well as California which are two very unique models, and right now -- last year, we introduced the Oregon model and now we're working to introduce the California model in order to get bipartisan support and, hopefully, support from our Governor who has



so far vetoed the first attempt at automatic voter registration.

So I have a long testimony, but I will just put it into -- for you guys to put it in the record, but let me just read a few things out of this that I thought might be helpful.

on the front lines, we are sad to report that our democracy is under assault. On the national level, we have seen states move to gut the preclearance protections offered by Section 5 of the national Voting Rights Act. Following the United States Supreme Court's shameful decision in the Shelby County, Alabama, first holder decision, from Ohio to Texas to California, many states and governments have been implementing abhorrent voting practices that have people barred with racial discriminatory impact.

Meanwhile, after citizens united, our political systems have become flooded by oversized campaign contributions from a handful of wealthy individual donors and special interest groups.

So from a national perspective, we are concerned about what is happening at the state



level from North Carolina to Texas that you guys were just talking about. We've been concerned about the Voting Rights Act and what has happened in terms of gutting that. Those are two things that we work on throughout the country in DC as well as in the states. We're also very concerned about the issue of money and politics.

So nationally, we have been able to pass different options that would result in limiting control of special interest on our election system. In New York City, in Los Angeles, in Connecticut, one county, we were able to pass it on the East Coast for the first time; and now we are working hard to introduce it at the city level, City of Chicago.

Last year, we had an ordinance that was introduced which is a small donor public financing system. It was introduced based off of New York City's model which would limit campaign contributions to an amount of \$500 in aggregate per election cycle per donor. The first \$175 would be matched in a public fund 6 to 1. So in New York it's 6 to 1. In LA, it's 4 to 1. 6 to 1 has been known by experts across the country as kind of the



sweet spot in terms of enough money for candidates to really want to be enticed to use the system. And the idea is that if you're giving \$50, if you're giving a hundred dollars, you're not putting that control from lobbyist and big special interest or corporations on the elections. Instead, it's constituents that are being involved.

In New York City, we saw a rise in political participation throughout the system which the more people that are giving money into elections, as long as it's small donors in our mind, more likely that they're going to go to the ballot box on election day which is really, at the end of the day, what we are all about, wanting to increase civic engagement as well as breaking the barriers to the ballot box.

In Illinois, we saw just last year \$150 million spent on our state races. And right after the election, \$50 million was dropped by the Governor for a first-time installment two years prior to his next election. So it's really hard for people and communities to get faith back into their government while there's millions of dollars being spent to effect elections.



I'm sorry, because of Citizens United and Super PAC, but there are ways for us to combat that like the small donor public finance system which a few weeks ago we introduced also at the state level. Senator Daniel Biss introduced that a few weeks ago. We are working to try to get that passed out

of the Senate this session.

So we kind of feel like these two things converged, and we saw that on automatic voter registration. I don't know if anyone mentioned this earlier today. The responses we were getting from Republicans in the House, we got 15 House Representatives to support -- Republicans to support the bill and 13 in the Senate to support the bill.

Historically, what we've seen across the country is voting rights does not get bipartisan support when you're talking about expanding the franchise. We were able to do that here in Illinois; but most all the Republican votes flipped after hundreds of thousands to a million dollars was given by our Governor and right-wing PACs to make sure that they would not vote for the



automatic voter registration bill. And we had testimonies from -- not official testimony, but we have conversations with elected officials saying that they had no choice but they had to flip their vote because of the campaign contributions they received.

So even though this is about voting rights, the money and politics issue I think is something that is vitally important as well as everything people talked about to modernizing our system and better training for judges.

We do nonpartisan poll watching every year. We had a hundred poll watchers out in November, and what we have experienced more than anything else has been the lack of resources that are happening in the precincts and the challenge with all the different databases and information being funneled because we are in a system that is not one uniform system. It does make things very difficult on election day. And there are not enough nonpartisan poll watchers out there because we do see poll watchers that are with parties more than they are with trying to protect the vote.

So that's some of the things in my



testimony, but I'll just kind of stop there. 1 2 Thank you, Mr. Gladstein. CHAIRMAN LINARES: 3 would you be willing to take a question or two? 4 MR. GLADSTEIN: I would. 5 Does anyone on the panel CHAIRMAN LINARES: have a question, on the committee? I do actually. 6 7 I have one question. Ms. Wortham, please. 8 The congressmen who said that MS. WORTHAM: 9 they flipped their vote because they were able to obtain funding, is there any way to obtain 10 11 statements from these people to that effect? Or is this just anecdotal? 12 13 It's anecdotal. MR. GLADSTEIN: 14 I don't like anecdotal. MS. WORTHAM: 15 So I'm not putting that into MR. GLADSTEIN: 16 the record. 17 MS. WORTHAM: I'm serious about that. 18 MR. GLADSTEIN: So what I would say in terms of being like on the record is that the pressure that 19 20 it takes on State Representatives, Congress people, 21 either State Representatives to deal with making 22 policy that's right by the people and their 23 constituents is really hard when they get the



24

pressure of lobbyists and big money. And that

played out with automatic voter registration.

If I could get stories, I would love to, but that would force you guys in the future -CHAIRMAN LINARES: Just to move forward, too.
So your statements will definitely be on the record, and whether we have someone else's statements who are not here, it is your statement that will be on the record.

With that said, I do have a question.

It's probably because it's the end of the day, I'm not thinking clear headed right now, but you mentioned the 6 to 1 match. Can you elaborate on that? I'm just not thinking clearly on how that would work.

MR. GLADSTEIN: So the way the system would work is there's a public fund that if a candidate decides to elect -- they have to voluntarily elect to be in the system. The Supreme Court says that you cannot force an elected official into a public financing system. Then there's a rule that they have to abide by. The main one is that they cannot receive any donation more than \$500 during an election cycle from an individual donor. So they can receive five donations, but none of them can



be, total, \$501 or more. And if you're in that system, the first \$175 from each of those donors would be matched 6 to 1.

So if you're running for office, and I give you a hundred dollars, then mine would be matched 6 to 1. So a public fund would kick in \$600 plus my \$100 where I started. So it's \$700 total. Right? I don't have the influence because all I do is give you a hundred dollars; but now you have six times the amount of resources to run campaigns. And I'm now engaged because I gave money into the electoral process. It is more likely that I will then not only go the ballot box but be involved in the political process moving forward if I actually wrote a check or gave money in some way to you as a candidate.

MR. KAZMI: We have a joint question. Who is financing the public fund?

MR. GLADSTEIN: I was waiting for that question. So in the systems across the country, it is the part of the general fund of a city or a county. In Chicago, for example, it is .01 percent of the whole budget. It would take about -- a Cadillac version would be about \$8 million of a



\$8 billion budget. 1 2 It sounds like potentially a lot of money 3 when you say \$8 million, but it's also a small 4 percentage to transform the system. There have been also conversations about taxes and other means 5 and contributions from corporations to help to 6 7 balance that out. 8 Ouestions from those who CHAIRMAN LINARES: 9 have not asked yet? Thank you so much for your 10 public comments today. With that, any other 11 concluding thoughts from the Committee? 12 well, thank you everyone for being here. 13 Thank you to the Committee for your questions. 14 Thank you to the audience for being here. Thank you to the staff for organizing this. Thank you to 15 16 the transcriber for being here all day and working 17 with us. with that, I'm going to gavel one more 18 We are adjourned. Thank you. 19 time. 20 (Whereupon, the Public Hearing 21 adjourned at 4:26 o'clock p.m.) 22 23 24



1	STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) ss:
3	COUNTY OF W I L L)
4	
5	ANNA M. MORALES, as an Officer of the
6	Court, says that she is a shorthand reporter doing
7	business in the State of Illinois; that she
8	reported in shorthand the proceedings of said
9	Public Hearing, and that the foregoing is a true
10	and correct transcript of her shorthand notes so
11	taken as aforesaid, and contains the proceedings
12	given at said Public Hearing.
13	IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF: I have hereunto set
14	my verified digital signature this 20th day of
15	March, 2017.
16	
17	
18	
19	anna M. Moralis
20	Com 111. Morace
21	Illinois Certified Shorthand Reporter
22	
23	
24	

